

GENERAL LIBRARY
JUN 27 1919
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XIV JUNE 1919

Number 9

Editorial	529
Representative Government in the Ancient Polities	
Tenney Frank	533
Rome and Her Subject Peoples	
G. A. Harrer	550
The Structural Similarity of <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> as Revealed in the Treatment of the Hero's Fate	
Samuel E. Bassett	557
In Memoriam	
Edward Bull Clapp	James Turney Allen 564
Teresio Rivoira	A. W. Van Buren 566
Kirby Flower Smith	G. J. Laing 567
The One and the Many	Josiah Bridge 570
Current Events	578
General Comment	581
Book Reviews	585
<i>Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie von Ausgang des klassischen Altertums bis auf Goethe und Wilhelm von Humboldt, Borinski (Oldfather); The Sequence of Tenses in Plautus, Heffner (Fowler).</i>	
Recent Books	589
General Index	590

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,
FUKUOKA, SENDAI
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
The University Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
The University of Kansas

For New England

MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

*FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
The University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
The University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
The University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

*Deceased.

The *Classical Journal* is published monthly except in July, August, and September at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 11s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORD, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to JAMES T. ALLEN, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to resident of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

Entered as second-class matter, May 16, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of July 16, 1894.

Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on August 23, 1918.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XIV

JUNE 1919

NUMBER 9

Editorial

SELLING OURSELVES

In these days of expert advertising and salesmanship, business men often seem to put more stress upon the advertising of their goods than upon the excellence of the goods themselves. They recognize that even though they may have the best of wares in stock these must be brought to the attention of the buyer if they are to be sold. "It pays to advertise." All business men now recognize this principle. There is no longer any such thing as business modesty or propriety or dignity to prevent an enthusiastic presentation of a merchant's wares to a buying public.

In professional circles, however, this method of advancement is still frowned upon. Self-respecting doctors, lawyers, preachers, teachers, count it as decidedly *infra dig.* to seek to gain success by business methods. We honor them for this stand; for, after all, theirs is a far different case from that of the merchant. The latter may without immodesty sing the praises of his wares, but the wares of the former are the men themselves, and these they may not with dignity advertise before their public.

And yet, while professional dignity may prevent us from bringing ourselves before the public in a business advertising way, this fact does not on the other hand excuse modesty to the verge of self-effacement, nor professional dignity that freezes and diverts even that small stream of interest which would naturally flow in its direction. If we may not push ourselves into public notice, at least we need not shrink away from this as if we had an apology to

make for our profession, need not avoid contact with our public where contact is natural and desirable. Above all things, if we may not push ourselves, we may at least without any hesitation push and exalt our profession and, if teachers, our particular departments, and hence in this entirely impersonal way we may "sell ourselves."

There are thousands of teachers of Latin in this country who have not as yet attached themselves to any one of the great Classical Associations, though these in nearly all cases have been in active and helpful existence for many years. Why? Is it through ignorance of the existence of these associations and their purpose? Is it through a feeling of aloofness and self-sufficiency? Is it because of indifference? lack of ambition? laziness? Whatever the reason, it must be evident that this voluntary self-withdrawal from the great body of one's most alert fellow-professionals is not only to the detriment of the cause itself for which we work but in the end is sure to limit the advancement of the teacher himself. What doctor can afford to "flock by himself," attend no medical conventions, read no medical journals? What minister dares be a recluse? No more can a teacher succeed if he is not zealous not only to lay hold on all the world that is significant to his subject but to bring himself and his work in all proper ways before his own public, the public of his school and of his town. The result of this hopeful and energetic "self-salesmanship," as has been illustrated again and again in pages of the *Journal*, has been large and many-sided. We have seen the study of Latin in high schools made popular among students, and win favor among parents, all because of the optimistic zeal and thorough belief of a teacher in her subject. We have also seen this teacher's experience expressed in thoughtfully worked out articles, which have found a wide audience through the pages of the *Journal*.

IUSTITIA TENAX

Out of Armageddon order is beginning to appear. The clash of arms is wellnigh stilled; and through the clash of opinions, now at its height, the voice of sanity, clear and insistent, may be heard. It is indeed heartening to read the address of Mr. Frederick Allison

Tupper before the Headmasters' Association of the United States, entitled "The Irrepressible Conflict," as published in the *Journal of Education*. After discussing the conflict between rank materialism and humanism in society and politics, Mr. Tupper takes up the conflict in education. He concludes:

We have compromised, we have yielded here, we have yielded there. Our line has been pierced at several points. We have been too quiescent and too acquiescent. If any of us said that German is a superb substitute for Greek, we have our reward. It is now time for us to fight with our backs to the wall. Though the world thunders with asseverations that there are short, easy, characterless ways of mastering the supremely fine and difficult art of living, we know that every such statement is as false and baneful as hell itself. We know that, if you neglect the study of Greek or Latin, or Science or Art or Mathematics, or anything else worth studying, you simply deprive yourself of the lasting advantages and satisfactions derived from those subjects. There is no substitute for Greek or Latin or any other literature or art, or any other important subject. Must we always be children amused first by one little toy and then by another? No! It is time to be men and to put aside childish things.

With our backs to the wall let us stand—

For real education, instead of false imitation;

For the inherent value of every important subject;

For thoroughness as opposed to superficiality and sham;

For the overthrow of educational Bolsheviks, hypocrites, charlatans, mountebanks, impostors, and incompetents, though their name be Legion;

For a life instead of a living;

For our priceless heritage from the past;

For the eternity of the soul and its proper nurture for the highest, the broadest, and the deepest usefulness, as against the mortality of the body and the meanly trivial shifting, and shifty devices of ephemeral, always self-centered and self-motivated opportunism;

For the "fairy tales of science," if you please, but mainly, "for the long results of time," as a proper training, not only for the here and now, but for the vast forever.

AMERICAN CLASSICAL LEAGUE

The idea of an American Classical League has now been before the public for nearly a year, having been first brought forward at Pittsburgh last July. The formation of such a league has been proposed by Dean West to the various classical associations and these have all expressed themselves as favorable to the proposition. The next step will be taken at Milwaukee where a National Classical

Conference will be held in connection with the annual meeting of the National Education Association, on Wednesday, July 2, and Thursday, July 3. The program is being prepared and the other arrangements are being made in co-operation with the National Education Association. The formal organization of the American Classical League will take place at the conference on Thursday, July 3. Further public notice will be given when the program is ready for announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE ANCIENT POLITIES

BY TENNEY FRANK
Bryn Mawr College

When Freeman wrote his elaborate *History of Federal Government* he could with the evidence then available enter a general denial that no ancient polity presented an example of real representative government. Though the bulk of historical material added since his day is not large, the new papyri and inscriptions have been relatively generous with data on the point at issue. A paragraph on the interesting Boeotian constitution, new details from the Athenian proposals which borrowed suggestions from it, inscriptions containing legal records from the more obscure leagues, not only have provided explicit evidence but have also aided in the interpretation of available sources not quite fully understood before. Even now we may not be permitted to say that any one ancient constitution had elaborated all the consequences of the principle of representation, but we may now at least see it at work under conditions so varied that we cannot longer deny that it was recognized as a useful and practical idea.

To be sure, the ancient philosophers did not submit the idea to a special analysis, but that is because they were usually concerned with the primary classification of polities, whereas the machinery of indirect government appeared to be only a convenient mode by which democracy might occasionally prefer to work. That as a method of procedure it should create qualitative differences in polities was not at once apparent.

In ancient days as in modern the device developed its possibilities very slowly and by way of compromise, a compromise that has entailed a surrender of privileges on the part of the sovereign and has therefore had to develop its possibilities despite the opposition of the sovereign. It would be difficult to point to any hereditary autocracy that has ever voluntarily shared its powers

and privileges with the representatives of the people. Similarly when the people themselves hold the reins of government they are loath to surrender their hold even to drivers selected by themselves. King Edward apparently asked for delegated representatives of the people only because this offered the easiest way of securing the support of the people when he was in danger, and it took centuries before this body of indorsers became a responsible government. Nor did the democratic Swiss states at first intrust any but strictly circumscribed functions to the envoys they sent to a common Diet, and only after centuries of mistakes could this council of envoys grow into a parliament of a sovereign union.

It was not a philosophic argument in favor of a natural-sized polis, nor was it a temperamental egoism in the race which created the Greek city-states and kept them from merging into a territorial state. The Amphictyonic Council with its system of delegations seems more than once to have suggested the machinery by which Greece could be unified. But the nature of the Greek migrations and the physiographic barriers of the land had militated from the first against unification, until indeed linguistic differences, peculiar local folk-ways, and diversity of economic needs grew into barriers that were even stronger. Among the village communities in each group there was usually one that attracted inhabitants more quickly than the rest because of some natural advantages, and such a village, if near the center of a group not too large, readily became a gathering-place for common tribal meetings and the seat of the tribal cult. Thus city-states grew—not as some a priori philosophers supposed who posited sophisticated city founders.

Here and there, however, several villages increased apace in different parts of such a dialect group. If none gained clear predominance and the ancient consciousness of tribal unity encouraged by external dangers still persisted, a federation of such cities was a natural result. In Boeotia, for instance, there were several fairly prominent cities in a naturally bounded plain some fifty miles long. Thebes was indeed strong enough at times to exert leadership, but there were also other towns of importance which proved quite unwilling to lose their identity. When therefore distance and the local patriotism of the cities militated against a government by a tribal

assembly, while at the same time the common welfare and common worship favored a single government, it was only natural that this should be carried on by a relatively small group of delegates apportioned to the members of the federation according to population. And in fact a fragment of a Greek historian found in Egypt (*Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 1909) proves this to be the case in the Boeotian League in 397 B.C. The league then consisted of eleven units, of which Thebes with its subject cities reckoned as four, Orchomenus and Thespieae as two each, Tanagra as one, and two groups of three small cities each also as one. Each unit contributed one boeotarch, sixty senators, and its quota of judges to the common government, while there is no trace of a popular assembly, which is usually the sovereign body in the Greek states. This common senate was therefore the responsible deliberative body of the league while the eleven boeotarchs formed its executive council, and both of these bodies apparently deserve to be called truly representative. Had this central government been allowed to live long enough to merge the league members into a thoroughly unified state, as for instance the Diet of the Swiss Confederation did in the nineteenth century, the Boeotian League would have stood out as a clear example of representative government in a sovereign territorial state in the fullest modern sense.

To be sure, there is still some doubt about the method of selecting the sixty deputies from each unit, and the prevailing view seems now to be that they were chosen by lot. The question is of course not very vital. If electoral qualifications were generally placed high—and in Boeotia a hoplite's census was probably required—choice by lot might be depended upon to secure men capable of presenting the views of their constituents. Selection by vote does not necessarily secure fair representation. However, there is no particular reason for supposing that the Boeotian units chose their delegates by lot rather than by vote, especially since the boeotarchs were elected. Since the units that furnished the senators were not the local administrative bodies and did not coincide with the cities which had senates of their own, it was not easy to make up the federal senate by the casting of lots among or by the local senates. It would seem then that the citizens of each unit, or at

least, of each district, must meet for this one task of selecting their delegates; and considering the importance of the senate and the aristocratic tendencies of Boeotia we may reasonably assume that the people were asked to elect suitable men by direct vote. Such an assumption is strengthened by the fact that the proposed Athenian constitution of 411—which was directly influenced by the Boeotian one—devised methods of choosing relatively large numbers of representatives by popular elections.

Thucydides indeed reveals the fact that the council of eleven generals was prone to make its own decisions when in the field, assuming that the senate would ratify its action, but the senate did not always acquiesce humbly to such treatment. It was indeed easily overawed, but *de jure* it was the responsible federal legislature which had in its hands the ultimate decision on all questions of foreign policy and on many matters of domestic concern; and, what is rarely found in Greece, its decisions were apparently final and did not have to be referred back to the local senates for ratification. If this is true, the senators were responsible representatives and not, as is more usual in Greece, merely instructed delegates, or delegates bound to refer back for instructions in each individual case.

The judgments of history fitted together from incomplete sources prove somewhat unstable when the people that was for centuries the synonym of stupidity finally is proved by a crumbling fragment of papyrus to have "anticipated substantially the whole modern system of government—a representative parliament, an elective executive, and a supreme court." Had Freeman known this constitution he would probably have read the fragmentary evidence regarding the other Greek leagues with a mind open to interpretations which he thought precluded, and his conclusions would of course have been different.

The Boeotian constitution bore direct fruit in the Hellenic confederation which Philip of Macedon called into being at Corinth after Chaeronea in 338 B.C. Philip, who had spent his youth at Thebes, had apparently learned the forms of the old Boeotian constitution there. This new league was of course to be subservient to the master, the king of Macedon, but that fact was not

apparent in its charter. As in Boeotia, districts (which in this case might be groups of adjacent states, or whole leagues) were given proportional representation, and the resulting senate had the power to elect its president and to act upon all questions of common interest without referendum to the constituent districts. Philip's own predominance and his disregard for local patriotism in shaping the units precluded the possibility of this league growing into a unified Pan-Hellenic state, but, except for that, the idea had many new possibilities. When Antigonos Doson revived the league he surrendered much of the federal strength by reinstituting a referendum of the decision to the constituent states, but by doing so he also won adherence to his idea more quickly. The later Hellenic League, therefore, though less truly a representative state than Philip's league, was a more practical approach to a unified Greece. Philip V, who at first made use of Antigonos' methods, soon brought the league upon the rocks by involving it in his own attack upon Rome, and thus vanished the one promise of a great Hellenic state under constitutional government.

The Aetolian League also employed the principle of representation, although the body of delegates did not here form as important a part of the government as in Boeotia. Whether this federation had borrowed the idea from Boeotia we cannot say, though this assumption would be reasonable, since the Aetolian League was constantly in close political touch with Boeotia during its period of formation and growth. However, the employment of deputies was so obviously the natural course when a widely extended democratic tribe without a dominating central city tried to preserve its unified existence against foreign pressure that borrowings need not be posited. If suggestions were needed the ancient Amphictyonic Council, to which Aetolia also sent delegates, was always a standing object-lesson. Now in Aetolia the citizens were jealous of their right to decide at first hand all important questions of state, but they could obviously not gather from the four corners of the far-spreading league to discuss every matter that must be decided. Their stated meetings were held but twice a year. Hence the council (*boulê*) which ordinarily existed to shape and formulate measures for the popular assembly was ever more depended upon

to decide serious questions in the intervals between the larger assemblies. In fact, when the final break with Rome came, the council was so dominant a factor in Aetolian politics that the Romans held the councilors responsible for the behavior of the state toward Rome. That the councilors were true representatives of the people in Aetolia is evidenced by an inscription which records a treaty arranging that each of two towns formerly united should in the future be represented in the federal council by members in proportion to the population of each (Michel, No. 22).

In studying the behavior of this league in its wars with Macedonia and with Rome, we notice clearly that as the league expanded and its foreign complications became ever more frequent and more intricate, the council of wiser heads and its select committee of *apocletoi* constantly assumed increasing importance, just as at Rome the senate grew from a council into a directing power when Rome had to face foreign questions that were beyond the scope of the populace. Had the Aetolian League met a less formidable enemy than Rome, so that it might have survived, a few generations of this kind of experience must have made the representative senate supreme in Aetolia also. At any rate the normal machinery which naturally develops into representative government in federal polities was there.

Of the corresponding federation in the Peloponnesus, the Achaean League, very little definite information is at hand. In general, however, the constitution seems to have been modeled upon the Aetolian. Here also the ordinary, though not the most vital, business of the federation was conducted by a council provided in some unknown manner by the member cities. We do not yet know whether these councilors were real representatives or whether they were merely fractions of the citizen body of each state. This league also ran athwart the path of Rome and suffered the inevitable fate; but the history of its last years proves that it, like the Aetolian League, was then well on the road toward a centralized government conducted by a select body rather than by a cumbersome primary assembly.

There were many other leagues—more than a score—which were growing up in the remoter districts of Greece when the famous

city-states were waning, but most of them are known to us only from fragmentary inscriptions. These records usually prove that primary assemblies bore the responsible burden of government, but they also tell of senates, and these were probably in many cases bodies of delegates chosen by the communities that constituted the federation. The evidence for such a method is fairly strong in the case of the Magnesians and the Lycian leagues, though in both cases the phraseology is inconclusive. At least the historian must now assume that the method was so widely in vogue that in the case of leagues which compassed much territory he may assume that the convenient machinery was accepted without prejudice. In two bodies at least—neither sovereign in political matters—delegated senates conducted all the requisite business, since the distances involved precluded the use of primary assemblies. The old Amphictyonic Council consisted of delegates sent by the several states of Greece. Athens elected her delegates by show of hands (the priestly members of the delegation being chosen by lot). Aetolia also elected by direct vote, while in autocratic states like Macedonia the delegates were doubtless chosen by royal appointment. This council, however, dealt mainly with sacred matters and had of course no direct means of securing the execution of its resolutions. A league of Aegean Islands (Nesiotes), conducting its business through delegates, also subsisted for some time during the third and second centuries for the protection of maritime commerce. An actual sovereign state this federation never was, but it supported a fleet of its own through indirect contributions. At any rate, all its affairs had to be conducted by a senate of representatives. The formation of the league was very loose; it was so dependent for practical support upon stronger states and its members were so far severed by diverse political and economic interests that it could not even under the most favorable circumstances have developed into a new state; but it did at least prove to a certain extent the prevalent belief in the practicability of united action through delegates.

The representative principle was then freely used by the Greeks when needed. It was not lack of political insight that prevented them from drawing all the logical consequences from the idea.

Rather there were separatistic factors of physical geography and consequently of linguistic and social differences that propagated the city-state ideal; and even when the tribe was clumsily large the primary assembly clung to its right of ultimate decision upon the most vital questions, partly because men are men and trust themselves rather than delegates, partly because the Greeks had emerged from regal government to democracy through the oligarchic form, and disagreeable associations therefore clung to the thought of a powerful senate. Nevertheless the Boeotian League proved that Greeks when not completely wedded to democracy knew how to use the appliances of representation in federal government for all the administrative functions of a sovereign state; the Hellenic League formed by Philip of Macedon, though hampered by overstrong leadership, demonstrated how the device becomes a necessity when widely separated peoples attempt to form an effective confederacy; and finally the Aetolian League illustrated how the body of delegates tended to grow into a governing Diet when the league expanded beyond the limits within which the gathering of a primary assembly became a striking inconvenience, and when it met with intricate questions with which the populace could not well cope. If no Greek state employed all the advantages of representative government at one time, at any rate every essential element of the principle was put to the test. In Boeotia, Aetolia, and the Hellenic League at least the deputies were fairly proportioned to the population. Direct election of the delegates by the citizens was probably the usual procedure. Finally, in several instances the senators were more than delegates bound to instructions or circumscribed in power by the necessity of securing subsequent ratification of action taken; they were true representatives of their constituents.

The Roman polity early set out on the imperial road, along which it advanced with confident step for centuries. Here in the one all-including state there were but few opportunities to experiment in new forms of government, since so vast an empire was at stake in each throw. However, the Romans also came to recognize the advantages of the representative in more than one instance.

In Latium the tribe segregated early into city-states. Raiding expeditions from the neighboring mountains compelled the village

communities to concentrate in defensible positions so that the original village groups—some fifty, we are told—gradually aggregated to a half-dozen cities. Then the old feeling of tribal unity naturally waned, and a new patriotism centering in the several cities came into being. Presently, under the temporary leadership of Etruscan princes, Rome as a city-state won a position of leadership among the Latin cities, and when discontentment and jealousy resulted Rome assumed hegemony in the group by force of arms. It was not long before Rome's power extended a hundred miles southward over peoples which could not effectively exercise a franchise at the city, and Rome had to devise some form of government that would at the same time be liberal enough to invite the subject and strong enough to control. It might seem that this was the proper moment to introduce the idea of representation, and according to Livy (viii. 5. 5) the subjected Latins at least asked for a fair quota of places in the senate; but apart from the fact that a controlling group seldom cares to part with or share its power, there were reasonable objections to it. The Roman populace had then been struggling for over a century to wrest control of politics from an oligarchical senate and had almost won their battle. They saw no doubt that a representative congress would soon outweigh the primary assembly of the city in strength, and oligarchy would return. Again, if Rome was to be liberal in the extension of the franchise the day would soon come when a system of proportional representation would bring the government into the hands of non-Latin peoples. We can readily see that Rome might soon have lost control of the government, and an inharmonious and futile federation would have displaced the strong state which had developed a consistent policy and a splendid organizing power. So far as Italy itself is concerned, the representative principle might have been tried in the Gracchan days when the allies had been fairly well Romanized, but it would have paralyzed the state if tried before.

Consequently, when the proposal of the Latins was made Rome preferred to adopt a different course. She formed a federation of several classes of citizen municipalities and dependencies, graduating them according to the requirements of each individual case.

The nearer peoples when well Romanized were admitted to full Roman citizenship; others were probationally accorded a share of such rights with a promise of ultimate full rights; while the more distant communities were attached to the federation by more or less favorable alliances according to circumstances, always with the promise of improved status in case of loyalty. This constitution, perhaps the most liberal and statesmanlike method of state-building of ancient times, proved for some decades thoroughly adequate to the task of unifying and Romanizing Italy. The logical consequence should have been representative government when the treaties were finally exchanged for full citizenship. But when the proper time came the vast extension of the external empire had trained the Roman nobles to look upon provincial offices as their fair spoils. The state was then already a parasitic tyranny. Even in the Second Punic War, when a prudent senator, Carvilius, proposed that the Latin municipalities be given a representation of two members each in the senate at Rome (Livy xxiii. 22)—and at that time the senate was practically the government—the aristocracy refused to share their responsibilities in any way that threatened to diminish their individual privileges, and the proposal fell through.

However, the Romans found the principle of representation suited to their needs when they were called upon to organize governments for the liberated Greeks after the Second and Third Macedonian Wars. When Flamininus had defeated Philip V, he, with the commission representing the Roman senate, had the task of setting up new states for several of the peoples freed from Macedonian rule, and in many cases they found the tribal cohesion so strong that the obvious solution lay in organizing a number of city communities into a federated state. The problems presented were often very intricate. In Thessaly, for instance, many influential cities desired autonomy, and the Roman senate naturally preferred to deal with the several cities rather than with dangerously large states; on the other hand, common rites, common language, historical precedent, and the need of a cohering power against the possible encroachments of Macedonia pointed to the advisability of federating the Thessalian cities into a union.

Another consideration was of moment. Flaminius and the commissioners were Roman aristocrats representing a senate which traditionally distrusted democratic forms. In fact the Greek democracies were suspected all the more because the Greek demos distrusted the aristocratic leanings of the Rome of that day. Now Flaminius so far humored the Greek populace in Thessaly as to give the individual cities a fairly democratic charter. He offered them the usual primary assembly, with a probouleutic council. The only aristocratic provisions were that certain property qualifications were stipulated for officials, and that proposals to the populace must come through the magistrate. However, for the federal government he combined Greek and Roman ideas in such a way as to preserve native forms to some extent and yet secure the aristocratic régime consonant with Roman senatorial ideas. He solved his difficult problem by placing the central government in the hands of a single senate—synedrion—made up of representatives of the cities.

This Thessalian federal government managed the affairs of a legally independent state for about fifty years. Inscriptions show that it performed its functions normally through that period at least, supporting a military force, legislating, settling disputes between member cities, sending and receiving deputations on matters of foreign policy, granting citizenship, etc. In fact, however, Thessaly was essentially a Roman protectorate, since it hardly dared to alter any of the arrangements made by Flaminius without consulting Rome (*Inscriptiones Graecae*, IX, 2, No. 89). At about 146 B.C.—after the reorganization of Greece—Thessaly became a part of the Roman province of Macedonia, but the league government persisted, though without political power, in its old form for several hundred years. For instance, in the early empire the senate was requested by Rome to arbitrate a dispute between two member cities, and the vote on that occasion records 334 representatives present (*Inscriptiones Graecae*, IX, 2, No. 162).

This form of government first made for Thessaly seems ultimately to have become the standard form for all leagues dependent upon Rome. Certainly the Boeotian League, which had long been democratic, was reorganized on those lines when it fell completely

under Rome's power after 146 B.C. The league of the Phocians was also managed after 146 by representatives of the member cities, in so far as it continued to exercise any power. However, these leagues apparently attained to this form of government only after their independence had completely vanished.

A more important and interesting example of representative government organized by the Romans is that which, in imitation of Flaminius, was bestowed by Aemilius Paulus and his commission upon the republics which they set up in Macedonia at the end of the Third Macedonian War in 167 B.C. After removing the king as prisoner to Rome the senatorial commission and the general divided the territory into four republics, drew up charters for the cities and a definite constitution for the states, laid down certain general regulations concerning revenues, armament, and coinage, then left the new states to work out their own salvation. In general, we know that the national constitution of the four states provided for an executive of each to be elected annually by the primary assemblies which gathered at the respective capitals, and that there was a senate in each state, to which very important, if not all, legislative functions were given.

The functions and composition of this senate deserve attention. It will be remembered that in most of the Greek states the senate was merely a counseling body which shaped the ordinances that were to be submitted to the deciding vote of the sovereign primary assembly of all qualified citizens. Not so in Macedonia. Livy says explicitly that the senate was formed to preserve the state from the mistakes of popular rule, "*ne improbum vulgus libertatem ad licentiam traheret*" (xlv. 18), and that the magistrates should govern in accordance with its decisions, "*quorum consilio res publica administraretur*" (xlv. 32). Polybius also (xxxi. 12), who describes the Achaean League as wholly democratic, though it had a senate, calls this particular constitution "democratic and senatorial," implying apparently that the populace now had the right to elect magistrates, and that the senate was the governing body of the state as in the Thessalian League formed by Flaminius.

How the senators were chosen for these important legislatures we are not explicitly told, but we are able to eliminate certain

possibilities. Direct election by the one primary assembly is out of the question, both because that would have thrown control into the hands of the *improbum vulgus* and because Livy mentions only the magistrates as subject to election at the general meeting (xliv. 29). Furthermore the senators were not procured as in Italian municipalities by virtue of some office in a municipality or of some property qualification, "synedros legendos" (Livy xlv. 32). Again, it is impossible to think that Paulus would have approved of selection by lot, an inefficient democratic method which never appealed to the Romans, and which they discouraged even at Athens when they became influential there. After eliminating these possibilities there is little doubt that the several municipal senates (which we know existed: Pol. 31. 26) were required to elect a definite number of representatives, subject doubtless to certain qualifications regarding age, occupation, and wealth. It would seem then that the government of these republics was in the hands of a unicameral representative senate and elective magistrates subject to the orders of this senate.

There is one more point in which these republics differed vitally from the older Greek republican leagues and also from the Thesalian government formed by Flaminius. The leagues had of course been federations of city-states approaching more or less closely to national unities, but after all not one of them, despite the efforts that it may have exerted, ever succeeded in merging its constituent units into a thoroughly welded central government. The citizens of the Achaean League were "Achaean," to be sure, so far as coinage or war was concerned; but they never lost consciousness of the fact that they were also citizens of what had been separate, independent city-states, city-states which at any moment might again have to stand alone. Not so in Macedonia. The Macedonian people, because of their common language, their supposed kinship, and their strong centralized government, had long shared in the benefits of a homogeneous *territorial* state. They had been classed according to cities by the Macedonian kings only for administrative purposes. As regards citizenship, they were always "Macedonians." It lay then in the nature of the case that when the new Macedonian republics were formed they could and of necessity must be unified states with a strong central

government, and that these states would be in no danger of disintegrating into separate city-states—a danger which was always imminent in the leagues. It is in this respect that the new states were perhaps most unlike other ancient republics.

It is a great misfortune that this fruitful experiment failed to develop into a standing object-lesson in republican government. It was only some sixteen years after its formation that a pretender to the inheritance of Perseus called upon the Macedonians to unite under the old regal forms of Alexander. They were well enough satisfied with Paulus' constitution to refuse the call, but the pretender raised an army in Thrace, invaded Macedonia, and destroyed the republics. To save itself from the recurrence of such accidents the Roman senate, now led by more hard-headed men than Paulus, reorganized Macedonia into a Roman province, and the memory of one of Rome's most brilliant experiments in government gradually faded from the records.

We have attributed these experiments to Flaminius, Paulus, and the two commissions that worked with them. It may be worth noting that these men, like most Romans, were far from being theoretical experimenters, and that they kept their feet on the solid ground of experience. These men realized from their experiences with the Achaeans, Aetolians, and Boeotians that the primary assemblies of the Greek leagues were not very friendly to Rome; also that such assemblies were difficult for Roman legations to deal with when quick action was necessary. They discovered furthermore that autocrats like Philip and Antiochus, who opposed Rome, always appealed to the populace against the aristocracies for support. Indeed the Romans all through their imperialistic career—except perhaps during the brief Gracchan epoch—labored to gain dominance for the propertied classes, who of course were most favorable to firm government and the régime of peace which Roman intervention usually procured. The Roman charters drawn up for Sicilian cities in 193 and in 131 B.C. were decidedly aristocratic. Mummius followed the same principle in making charters for the cities of the Peloponnesus when he wrecked the Achaean League in 146, and several inscriptions containing legislative acts of Greek

cities under Roman sway are signed simply by the senate without the concurring vote of a primary assembly. It is clear, therefore, that Flaminius and Paulus were working along orthodox Roman lines when they placed the power in a senate and excised the usual Greek primary assembly. However, since Rome offered no model for a senate which could equitably represent several widely separated cities, and which could be depended upon to speak reliably for all parts of an extensive territory, these constitution makers were glad to accept a Greek device which accomplished this purpose. Both of them dealt frequently with the *synedria* of the Aetolian and Achaean leagues, and it was probably one of these leagues that furnished the model for the new senates.

There is one more constitution which is believed by some students to have made important use of the representative principle, namely the one shaped by the Italian allies that revolted from Rome in 90 B.C. when their request of Roman citizenship was refused. To be sure Diodorus (37. 2), our chief authority, adds the disparaging statement that the constitution was essentially a copy of the Roman polity, and Mommsen interprets his evidence in the spirit of that statement. However, we need not hastily assume from what we know of Diodorus that he was capable of making a discriminating analysis of vital elements that may have existed beneath certain superficial resemblances. The Italians apparently adopted the double consulship and the board of praetors from Rome; they also, as at Rome, intrusted the election of magistrates to a primary assembly, although some of the voters lived more than two hundred miles away. But they did at least comprehend a fact which the Romans had refused to acknowledge in their own government, that a primary assembly under such circumstances could not represent all sections of the nation fairly. Accordingly, despite strong democratic leanings, they frankly laid the task of governing upon a senate of five hundred.

Though this is all we know definitely, we may be permitted to examine possibilities regarding the composition of the senate. It is entirely conceivable that the first senate was selected by a committee, and that in the future vacancies were to be filled by censorial

selection from the ex-magistrates, as was the custom at Rome. If that was the case, the senators were in no sense true representatives of the tribes.

However, we know that tribal sentiment was very strong among the Samnites, the Marsi, and the other tribes. They had long had local self-government, had had assemblies, senates, and magistrates of their own, had always fought in the Roman armies by units under their own officers, and had dealt with Rome, at least formally, as well-organized states. Now it is difficult to think that the strong Samnite tribe, for instance, of whose citizens but few could afford to go to the elections at Corfinium, would acquiesce in a government whose ruling body consisted *ex officio* of men elected solely by those who could readily assemble at Corfinium. If the statesmen who made the constitution placed the government in the hands of a senate rather than in the hands of a primary assembly in order to obviate the dangers of a government managed by the citizens near Corfinium, they probably also took the next logical step and organized the senate in such a way that it would be representative of all the tribes. The idea could not have been entirely beyond their vision, since the Latins had at least twice proposed that scheme to Rome, since all the Italic tribes were accustomed to elect men for delegations that went to Rome to consult the Roman senate on matters of common interest, and since furthermore the constitutions devised by Flaminius and Paulus still existed in several states of Greece. It is very likely, therefore, that this senate of five hundred was to consist of deputies to be elected by the various tribes and cities of the league, apportioned according to the population of each. Whether such elections would be held by the local tribal senates or by the local assemblies is a matter of less importance, though considering the democratic learnings of most of these tribes, we should naturally suppose that the people elected directly.

This new government was wrecked, not because of any inherent weakness—it conducted the war with great skill—but partly because Rome was supported by the resources of a vast empire and partly because Rome confessed herself in the wrong and granted the allies their original demands. The result was the destruction of a con-

stitution which if not conforming to all the requirements of representative government contained all the essentials that might readily have developed that form.

The Greeks and Romans, then, were well aware of the advantages of government by deputies and frequently employed parts of its machinery. It is largely due to accident that no state of importance drawn upon a free use of the principle survived for long. After Rome became supreme in the Mediterranean world there was no room for political experiments outside of the empire, while the world-state itself was too unwieldy and contained too many heterogeneous elements to permit a thoroughgoing application of the principle.

In conclusion we may recall that the interesting provincial concilia made up of delegates sent by the various provincial communities to annual meetings held at the provincial capitals prove that the ideas of Flamininus and Paulus bore fruit in the empire, even though these concilia were supposed to concern themselves solely with religious matters. In the late empire, at least, these councils often discussed temporal matters as well, and their recommendations to the emperors had no small influence upon the policies of the government. Ultimately the councils of the church adopted the machinery of these pagan concilia, and it is not improbable that such church councils first suggested the machinery that finally developed into the parliaments of modern states.¹

¹ See the following:

Swoboda, *Griechische Staatsaltertümer*, 1913 (with excellent bibliography).

Freeman, *History of Federal Government* (ed. by Bury, 1893).

Bonner, "The Boeotian Federal Constitution," *Class. Phil.*, V, 405; X, 381.

König, *Der Bund der Nesioten*, 1910.

Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*.

Articles on "Amphictyony" and "Concilia" in Pauly-Wissowa.

Frank, "The Macedonian Republics," *Class. Phil.*, IX, 49.

ROME AND HER SUBJECT PEOPLES

By G. A. HARRER
The University of North Carolina

Among the causes of the disintegration of the Russian Empire and of Austria-Hungary one of the foremost has been the failure to solve in any adequate way the problem of the proper treatment—political, military, economic—of their various subject peoples. This problem was handled apparently with much greater success by ancient Rome, if success may be measured by the number of years of continued existence, and by the evident satisfaction of subject peoples with imperial rule.

In more than one respect no doubt Rome's problem was comparatively simple. For the most part there was no strong self-conscious feeling of separate individual nationality among the conquered. Where such feeling did exist, as for example in the Jewish people, Rome's success was often only a qualified one. It must be recognized, too, that after Rome had won her empire there was no other well-governed state to serve (as does the United States today) as an example worth imitating by any part of the Roman world which might want to set up an independent government. The shrewd general, Agricola, was of the opinion that it would be of advantage to the Romans in Britain if Ireland, too, were subdued, and liberty taken out of sight. Democratic government was known to be sure in Greece, but only as applied to a small unit, the city-state. Aristotle considered a roster of not more than 10,000 citizens ideal for a democracy. Poor communications, the lack of newspapers, a low level of education, made impossible the formation of public opinion, as we know it today, in the Roman Empire as a whole or in any considerable section of it, a public opinion to oppose or to guide the imperial government.

These conditions, while they facilitated Rome's governing independently from the center, resulted naturally among provincials

and Roman citizens alike in an absence of any feeling of responsibility in the state. In fact for the most part there was no conception of responsibility. When the troops of Vespasian and Vitellius were fighting in the streets of Rome for the rule of the world, the people looked on as at a gladiatorial combat and applauded.

There were other difficulties. At the beginning of our era after some three centuries of expansion, Rome now under an emperor was sovereign in all lands bordering on the Mediterranean, and more. This vast empire had been won partly by "peaceful penetration," partly by annexation at the desire of those annexed, and partly, or largely, by annexation due to "military necessity." But the people of Rome had not grown politically with their empire's territorial growth. Up to the time of the emperors the senatorial ruling class, and the common people too, had viewed and used the provinces as a means to "get rich quick," as something belonging to Rome, but not of Rome's political life. The historian Tacitus tells us that as late as the middle of the first century a war of revolt in Gaul between the natives and the Roman legions was looked upon as a foreign war by the citizens of Rome. There was no feeling of unity of empire at that time even among the Romans themselves.

Lack of union was from another point of view inevitable in an empire composed of so many various peoples. Rome was a conglomerate in a far greater degree than Austria-Hungary has been. More languages were spoken within her borders than ever at the tower of Babel. Her population was heterogeneous in the extreme. And these various peoples were in all stages of civilization, from the very primitive African or Briton to the Greek, who was intellectually the superior of his Roman ruler. And yet this ununified empire lived on for centuries, was never broken or seriously troubled by revolt of subject peoples within, but became more unified as time went on, so that in the year 400 the poet Claudian from the Greek East could say of the people of the whole empire, "We are all one nation." And another poet, Rutilius Namatianus of Gaul, declares in an apostrophe to Rome, "You have made of diverse races one fatherland."

In the Roman Empire government emanated from the center, Rome. All governors, judges, military commanders, officials of

the treasury, were appointed by the emperor or the senate, the provincials and the Roman people having no say in the matter. The most they could do was to exercise a kind of control over these officials by their legal right to send formal approval or disapproval of them to the emperor and to bring them to trial at Rome for flagrant misrule or extortion. The success of this part of the system depended largely on the character of the ruling emperor. A representative government of the provincials at Rome was not even thought of. The very idea was scarcely known in the ancient world, and was never widely applied. None of the provincial peoples had ever lived under such a form of government, and few under any form of democracy. Many of them had always been subject to an irresponsible government, and for them Rome's rule was generally far less arbitrary.

The provincials were not, however, absolutely excluded from all opportunity to share in the government. Rome was among ancient peoples comparatively free with grants of citizenship which carried with it greater legal, political, and business rights and privileges. What that citizenship might mean to an individual is seen in the case of St. Paul during his imprisonment and trial in Judea. And that citizenship could lead to high position. Gauls sat in the Roman senate before the middle of the first century, Greeks were governing provinces, and a Moor is known as a general of very high rank in the reign of Trajan. Freedmen, former slaves, held important posts in the bureaus of the imperial government at Rome. The emperor Trajan was a Spaniard by place of birth, if not by blood, and in the early part of the third century a Moor, and again a Syrian, gained the imperial power. It is significant that in this period—the third century—citizenship was granted finally at a stroke to all the inhabitants of the empire.

During the period of the republic Rome had filled the ranks of her armies largely with Romans and with Italians of kindred stock; but under the empire she drew more and more on the provincials. In fact Romans and Italians were finally exempted from service as a privilege of the ruling race. So too the Greeks generally were exempt, regarded as they were by the Romans as unwarlike. This policy, a terrible mistake especially when applied to Rome's own

people, was kindness itself to the individuals concerned. They lived in security for which they never had to fight. Though Rome claimed the right to conscript in the provinces, and exercised it on occasion, generally speaking her forces were maintained by the volunteer system. And gradually she came to use particularly men of the less civilized and more warlike races, Moors, Celts, and Germans. Many divisions of native troops were flattered by being enrolled under their racial name, so that we read of cohorts of Thracians, of Syrians, of Spaniards. Some of the subject tribes were rewarded for large and warlike contingents by exemption from all taxes. The army was altogether a professional one, for service in it was for a long period up to 25 years. The discipline was strict, but the pay was good, and at the end of the period of service a grant of land and of money was in order. If the soldier was not already a Roman citizen he was further rewarded, at the end of his service, by grant of citizenship to himself and all his family.

The number of Rome's troops was about 300,000. By the end of the first century most of them were stationed on the northern and eastern frontiers. Only at a few points within the empire was there any considerable force, in itself an indication that revolt of the subject peoples was little feared. In many parts of the empire men lived their lives without seeing even a corporal's guard of Roman soldiers. This force was not for conquest. In the words of a historian, the Greek Appian, "The emperors on the whole aimed to preserve the empire by prudent measures rather than to extend their sway indefinitely." This force was for the protection of the empire. It made possible the *pax Romana* with its attendant economic prosperity. These were Rome's greatest gifts to the ancient world. Of peace and prosperity the poets sang in Augustus' day. But even a generation or more earlier, in the last days of the republic, Cicero could write to his brother, who was governor over Greeks in Asia Minor, "Asia should think of this point (when she would complain of the taxes) that she would be free from no calamity of foreign war and civil strife, if she were not a part of this empire. But since this empire cannot possibly continue without taxes, Asia should calmly with some share of her income purchase lasting peace and quiet." This was from the Roman point of view.

It is interesting to compare with the statement of Cicero the sober judgment of a subject Greek, Plutarch, a century and a half later: "Now you know that peace, liberty, prosperity, large population, harmony are the greatest blessings of a state. In these times the Greek people need no statesmen to secure them peace; for war has gone from us and has vanished absolutely; and of freedom the people have as much as the emperors think best, and more would probably not make conditions better." Fifty years after Plutarch, Aristides, a Greek lecturer, could say: "The earth has been made the home of all by the Romans. Greeks and barbarians can travel everywhere freely. No longer are we terrified by wild mountains, or by the Arabian desert, or by hordes of barbarians. The Romans have made Homer's saying true, that the earth is common to all. They have bridged rivers, made roads through mountains, made deserts inhabitable, and by custom and by law have governed the world." Expressions of opinion on the Roman Empire are rare. The peoples are for the most part inarticulate. And yet in every section of the empire stone tablets containing honorary inscriptions to Rome and her emperors are found. Not all of them surely are hypocritical. In a little town in Andalusia an inscription has been discovered which reads, "In honor of the emperor Caesar Trajan, greatest and best ruler, preserver of the human race." This was set up after the emperor's death. An instance, by contrast, of what Rome's protection meant is found in the description of the condition of the inhabitants of Britain on the withdrawal of all Roman forces in the fifth century. St. Gildas writes of an appeal for help from Rome, "The barbarians drive us into the sea; the sea throws us back on the barbarians; so two ways of death assail us—we are either put to the sword or are drowned."

To praise Rome's rule for the peace and prosperity it brought under the protection of her armies is not to praise all the conditions prevailing in the empire. Evils there were, for example the dreadful slave system which was kept up as long as Rome stood, and the serf system of the time of Rome's decline. But it was protection that Rome guaranteed her subjects. For almost three hundred years, beginning with Augustus, she made good her guaranty satisfactorily, and for another two hundred years with indifferent suc-

cess. In return for this protection, or rather to make it possible, in addition to enrolling provincials in her legions, she levied taxes. In the time of the republic, to enrich the Roman treasury, taxes were exorbitant, and in the time of her decline, to support a dying state, they were intolerable. But in the heyday of Rome, the first two centuries after Augustus, taxes were moderate and were levied, generally speaking, fairly, and simply to supply the state's needs. The emperor's attitude is clear in a letter of Tiberius to an extortionate governor of Egypt, "It is the duty of a good shepherd to shear his sheep, but not to flay them." In times of calamity, such as a great fire or an earthquake, the emperor sometimes remitted taxes for as long as five years. The empire was not a money-making scheme for the Roman nobility. As the historian Appian states, "On some of the subjects the Romans lose money, but are ashamed to give them up however costly to themselves."

The imperial government was carried on almost entirely without direct participation by the subject peoples. That is not to say that the provincials had no share at all in their own government. Local self-government was the rule to a very large extent wherever Rome found a people capable of it. Combined with this policy, an active encouragement of local pride and patriotism developed a healthy municipal life. And in the various localities the people were allowed to live under their own laws to which they were accustomed. Local laws, local customs, local religions—all were respected by Rome as long as they were not in opposition to her government. In this respect Rome resembles most nearly the British Empire, and seems very much superior to modern Russia or Austria. The letters of the emperor Trajan to his governor, Pliny, show the almost painful efforts that were made not to interfere with the provincials' peculiarities. A particularly interesting illustration of this policy is found in an imperial rescript of the emperor Valerian still existing on stone. It was written about 255 A.D. to confirm rights and privileges which had been originally granted to a religious association in Syria by a Greek monarch more than three centuries earlier. Rome tried to adapt her rule to conditions of government as she found them. In the East she used largely as a unit of local government the Greek city-state, and

in the West various tribal divisions. Few general principles were everywhere alike enforced. Some localities for various reasons were favored above others, for instance Athens, looked upon almost with reverence as the seat of culture, had practically complete freedom. Some emperors, as Hadrian, honored her by becoming Athenian citizens, and by holding city offices as a Greek.

Rome made little attempt to force her own language on her subjects. In this particular Rome's methods, if studied by German statesmen, might have saved them from some of their blunders in their repressive treatment of Poland and Alsace-Lorraine. Naturally the official language of the government and of the military establishment was Latin. To serve in any official capacity under the imperial rule necessitated the learning of Latin sooner or later. And among the non-official classes Rome strongly encouraged the learning of her own tongue. Her success in this policy of encouragement is evidenced by the fact that during the whole course of the empire's existence many of the greatest writers came from the provinces, particularly from Gaul and Spain and Africa, and still more by the fact that the French and Spanish languages today are largely Latin in origin. In the East the spread of Latin was not general. In fact Rome apparently made small effort to spread it there. Greek civilization was dominant, and the Greek language became the language of the Roman East, though other languages also persisted. Aramaic was spoken by the Jews, Coptic by the Egyptians, and Punic in the territory of Carthage even down to the fall of Rome.

Protection from foreign invasions, prohibition of civil strife in cities or between cities, the resulting feeling of security, the possibility of economic prosperity, combined with the Roman policy of non-interference with local ways of living, made the subject peoples content under Roman rule.

THE STRUCTURAL SIMILARITY OF *ILIAD* AND
ODYSSEY AS REVEALED IN THE TREATMENT
OF THE HERO'S FATE

BY SAMUEL E. BASSETT
University of Vermont

The essential principle of classic art, whether plastic or literary, is form or law. As applied in poetry it may be called the bridle rein of Reason guiding and controlling the celestial steeds which draw the chariot of the imagination. It is the application of *Λόγος* to the creative faculty of the mind, and consists in the choice and arrangement of material according to a clearly indicated design which results in structural unity, *εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖσιν*. This principle is most easily recognized in the Dorian ode and in Attic tragedy, but the germs are to be found in Homer, the quickener of every Hellenic poet. The architectonic features of the two Homeric poems, although differing widely from those of Attic drama, for example, are nevertheless quite as characteristic, but the laws of the Homeric epic and the matchless art of the poet are such that the many obscure the one for those whose eyes are fixed so closely on the parts of the structure that they lose the impression of the edifice as a whole. The purpose of this paper is to call attention to a remarkable similarity of structural motif, hitherto unnoticed, between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. But before doing this it is necessary to sketch roughly a few features of the architecture of the two poems which can hardly be accounted for otherwise than by assuming that one great mind—that of the great poet—created them both. I will begin with what is known to all—the unity of time, of theme, and of plot.

An epic poem has been compared to a journey down a picturesque river. The natural way to make this journey is to start at a given point and travel continuously without much reference to the scenery of either the upper stretches of the stream or the part

below the journey's end. This is what is done in the folk-epos and in all Greek epic poems except the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In these alone the actual journey covers only a little more than 1 per cent of the entire length of the river—six or seven weeks out of ten years. It is as if our sail down the Danube, for instance, were to begin a few miles above, and end a few miles below, the Iron Gates. Yet after reading the two poems we feel, to continue the figure, that we have gained a good impression of the whole stream, for in the *Odyssey* one knows the river from the beginning, we may say, tells us of its upper reaches, and in the *Iliad* we find that the most interesting and significant features of the whole river valley are massed together in the few miles which we travel. I mean, of course, that the duel between Paris and Menelaus, the marshaling of the hosts, the description of the Greek heroes from the wall above the Scaean Gates, and a few other features, which really belong at the beginning of the ten years' war, are placed by the poet near its close.

In the selection and treatment of the theme, too, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* resemble each other to a remarkable degree, and differ radically from other Greek epic poetry of which we know. The *Iliad* is the best account which we have of the Trojan War as the *Odyssey* is of the return of the heroes of that war;¹ yet the themes of both poems offer a striking contrast to those of the rest of early Greek epos. For example, the two great poems of the Theban Cycle apparently took for their subject the Seven against Thebes and the Epigonoï, respectively.² In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, one hero is selected, and even then the poet is not content, but delimits his theme still further: in the *Iliad* it is the wrath of Achilles; in the *Odyssey*, not ἀνὴρ, but ἀνὴρ πολυτρόπος, the *crafty* Hero—a master-stroke which can hardly have been the work of different poets even of the same school. We shall return to this point later. But first let us consider a

¹ The νόστοι of Odysseus, Nestor, Menelaus, and Agamemnon are told at length; the fate of the two Ajaxes and the safe home-coming of Idomeneus, Diomedes, and Neoptolemos are at least referred to in the *Odyssey*.

² Cf. the first lines of the two poems:

Thebais, frg. 1 (Kinkel), Ἄργος ἄειδε, θεά, πολυδίδυμον, ἔνθα ἀνακτες—
Epigonoï, frg. 1 (Kinkel), Νῦν αὖθ' ὀπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι.

few features in the handling of the plot which illustrate the architectural similarity of the Homeric poems. (1) The *Odyssey* falls naturally into two parts, Return and Vengeance. Now the *Iliad* likewise divides in twain, (a) the Wrath and its results, (b) the Reconciliation and its results. (2) The climaxes of the two poems show many similarities: in both cases the *peripeteia* occurs in the antepenultimate episode (or the twenty-second book) of the poem; the events of the day of the climax are most fully described; the psychological state of the hero is pictured before the day begins; most of the characters, including the gods in the *Iliad*, and Athena, the only divinity concerned, in the *Odyssey*, are massed on the stage for the dénouement, and the heroines, Andromache and Penelope, are removed from the scene until the issue is decided. (3) As Professor Scott has pointed out,¹ in the conclusions of the two poems the stage is crowded, and in both poems there is a balance between opening and closing scenes.

These examples may serve as illustrations of what I mean by structural resemblance. Now let us consider a feature of both poems, never before remarked so far as I am aware, which concerns the theme, the arrangement of material, and the fate of the hero.

Aristotle says that a poem to possess a unity which can easily be appreciated must have a beginning, middle, and end. Now the beginning ought at least to introduce the theme, the end to indicate the ultimate working out of that theme, and the middle to show the relation between the theme and the outcome. Miss Stawell² remarks that the end of the Homeric epic is peculiar: in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the poet leaves in our minds a suggestion of what is to come. More especially, we may say that a poem about a great hero should give us some inkling of his fate, and that a great poem about such a hero should also link his fate with that peculiar trait of his character which forms the theme and is the thread by which the plot hangs together. If the structural middle of the poem reveals this link, so much greater should be our admiration for the architectural skill of the poet. Wecklein³ in defending the Homericity of the ninth book of the *Iliad*, which is

¹ *Classical Journal*, XII, 400, 403-404.

² *Homer and the Iliad*, pp. 187-89.

³ *Studien zur Ilias*, 17.

regarded by many as being very late, remarks that it performs admirably the function of a μέσον. I should like to add that the ninth book of the *Odyssey* fulfils the same requirements, and that both of these μέσα indicate clearly the relation between the theme of their respective poems and the fate of the hero.

To make my meaning clear it is necessary to repeat what all know of the Greek idea of Fate: the future is known and fore-ordained by Moira, a potence higher than Zeus, yet the fated individual usually, if not always, by some act of *hybris* contributes to this fate. For example (δ 502), Aias might have escaped his fate if he had not "let fall a proud word, and become greatly infatuate." I wish to show that in the ninth book of both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the hero, because of that trait of character which forms the thread of the narrative, commits an act of *hybris*, and that in both cases this λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν ἐρινύς is directly concerned with his fate, however faintly the latter is emphasized in the poems.

We know that Achilles was fated to die at Troy. This is indicated at the beginning of the *Iliad* (A 352, 416), albeit in vague words. As the narrative progresses we see that this fate will be due to his own choosing. Thetis has told him (I 410-416) that he has a choice between two destinies, death with imperishable fame in the battles about Ilios, and a safe but inglorious return to Phthia. She likewise explains (Σ 96), just before he makes the fatal decision, that his death will come immediately after that of Hector, αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἑκτορα πόντος ἐτοῖμος. The situation, the words themselves, and the interpretation which Socrates (Plato, *Apology*, 28 C) gives to them make it clear that it is the death of Hector which will lead to that of Achilles. We have a right to infer, therefore, that the death of the hero of the *Iliad*, which is hinted at in A and I (the ἀρχή and the μέσον, respectively, of the poem), and often referred to in the second part of the poem, is intended by the poet to have been caused by his own choice, and that this choice was due to his rage against Hector, to which he was led indirectly by the Μῆνις.

It can also be shown that in refusing Agamemnon's offer of reconciliation, in Book ix, Achilles was guilty of *hybris*. In the first place, Agamemnon had offered all the atonement that was in

his power: the restoration of the prize, a large indemnity, and an alliance with his family. This alone might easily be regarded as sufficient evidence. But far more convincing is the long plea of Phoenix (I 434-605). This mentor of Achilles, who loves him as his own son, begs the hero to yield, not only because of the gifts offered by Agamemnon, but also to the prayers of the Achaean leaders (vss. 520-523). Prayers, he argues, bend even the will of the gods. They are daughters of Zeus, and if one refuse to hearken to them they pray their sire to send after him "Αρη, that he may pay for their slighting with his hurt (vss. 510-512). It is clear, therefore, that when Achilles rejects the offered reconciliation he is guilty of *hybris*, which is due to his angry temper and which leads to his doom (ὑβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ' ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν ἄτης, Aesch. Pers. 821).

In the *Odyssey* it is much the same. The ἄνδρα πολύτροπον of α 1 is the crafty Odysseus, and the hero's craft is seen in the climax of the poem, the slaughter of the suitors, just as the wrath of Achilles reveals itself in the taking off of Hector. By far the best example of the cunning of Odysseus is found in the ninth book, and it is in this book that the hero commits an act of *hybris* which the poet connects directly with his ultimate fate.

The theme of the Polyphemus episode is the δόλος of Odysseus. This theme the poet very skilfully introduces, in fact he seems to have created the bard, Demodocus, largely to prepare the way for this, the first great episode of the *Apologoi*. For just before Odysseus reveals himself to the Phaeacians he requests Demodocus to sing of the Wooden Horse, ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλω ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, that is, to describe the greatest strategem of the hero at Troy, as Odysseus was about to narrate the story of his most famous trick during his voyage home. The bard's song, therefore, forms the overture of the *Apologue*, and introduces the leading motif. This is further shown by the words of Odysseus (ι 19 f.),

εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, δς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.

Of all the adventures described by Odysseus none so well shows his craft as does the blinding of Cyclops, and it is this adventure,

too, which led to all his troubles, even, according to the poet, the suitors. For it is not until Polyphemus has prayed to Poseidon that Odysseus may return "late, ill, on the ship of another, and find trouble at home," that this series of misfortunes is assured him. That Cyclops knew who had blinded him was due to the leading trait of the hero's character, for the trick would have lost its savor if the victim did not know who did it. The amazing success of the strategem caused Odysseus to forget himself and 'utter a proud word,' "Not even Poseidon can heal thine eye." Then follows the curse, which is fulfilled to the letter, both in the remainder of the *Nóστος* and in the *Tίσις*. The curse of Cyclops, therefore, in a certain sense is the *μέσση* between the two parts of the plot.¹

Rössner² has remarked that Odysseus recognized his error, and after the slaughter rebukes Eurycleia when she would exult over the fallen suitors (as he had done over Cyclops). But atonement was necessary, as well as repentance. This is not so severe as in the case of Achilles, for the *hybris* had not been so great, but it nevertheless concerns the fate of the hero. Teiresias tells Odysseus (λ 119-137), and his prophesy is repeated by the latter to Penelope (ψ 248-284) in the first words which he utters after the recognition, that he must take an oar and travel inland until he finds a people who know not the sea, and there must set up the oar and offer a sacrifice to Poseidon, and later, at home, to the other gods, thus atoning by sacrifice, for the gods are propitiated in this way even if one were guilty of *hybris* (cf. I 499-501). After that Poseidon shall harm him no more; a gentle death shall be his, and it shall not come to him from the sea.

If the above exposition is accepted, it must be admitted that in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the fate of the hero is hinted at,

¹Professor Lane Cooper of Cornell University suggests to me that in ignoring Cyclop's offer of hospitality (ι 517-525), Odysseus was guilty of a mild sort of *hybris*. Every reader feels, I think, that the hero, remembering the cruel way in which Cyclops had fulfilled one promise (ι 356, 379), was justified in refusing to trust him again. Yet it must be admitted that if Odysseus had accepted the offer, and if Polyphemus had kept his word, there would have been no curse, and consequently no further adventures.

² *Untersuchung zur Composition der Odyssee*. Progr. Merseburg, 1904, p. 48.

although not described; this fate is directly connected with the hero's peculiar trait of character, which forms the theme of the story; the cause of the fate is revealed to us in the same place in each poem, and the episode in which it is revealed, because it forms to some extent a link between the two parts of the narrative, performs the office of a *μέσον*. These similarities seem to me to be so remarkable that I must believe them to be due to a single poet.

Analogies prove nothing, but they often help us to see the force of an argument. Let us take one from the sphere of plastic architecture. Let us suppose that the two greatest edifices which have survived from remote antiquity are so like one another in material, in decoration, and even in the cutting of the stones of which their walls are made, that no one hesitates to assign them to the same school. Let us further assume that in their plan and in their most striking structural characteristics they show a remarkable likeness to each other, but differ fundamentally from all other buildings of which we have any knowledge whatsoever. Are we justified in concluding that these similarities can be explained by a theory that the two edifices were planned by different men; that their surpassing unity was due to a development and enlargement by successive architects whose work was separated by generations and even by centuries, and that some of the most startling resemblances were due to late and inferior builders? Is it not at least more probable that one great mind planned them both?

IN MEMORIAM

EDWARD BULL CLAPP

Edward Bull Clapp, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, Emeritus, in the University of California, died at Berkeley on February 7, 1919, at the early age of sixty-three.

Although not unexpected by his immediate associates, his death came as a shock particularly to those of his friends who had not seen him for a number of years and to whom the mention of his name invariably suggested a commanding figure and an exuberant vitality. The first warning that his apparently superb physique might not long withstand the strain of life occurred as early as 1906 when he was but fifty years of age. A severe illness in the summer of that year was followed by a steady, though at first barely perceptible, failing of his powers, until a stroke of paralysis in the fall of 1914 made evident to all, except fortunately to himself, that the end was not far distant. Indeed, his activities as scholar and teacher virtually ceased at that time, and about two years later he received a disability pension from the Carnegie Foundation and thus retired from the position which he had held with dignity and honor for a period of twenty-three years.

Professor Clapp graduated from Illinois College in 1875 at the age of nineteen, and after a brief apprenticeship as a teacher in secondary schools accepted in 1882 the Professorship of Greek in his Alma Mater. Eight years later he became an Assistant Professor of Greek in Yale College, at which institution he had received in 1886 the degree of Ph.D., the previous year having been devoted to travel and study in Europe. In January 1894 he left Yale to become Professor of Greek in the University of California, which at that time was a small but lusty college of some four hundred or five hundred students. By his enthusiasm, his tireless energy, his vigorous teaching, and his gentle and courtly manner he built up in the University a strong department and fostered the

study of Greek in the high schools of the state until practically every public and private high school of importance in California offered several years of work in this subject. The majority of the teachers of Greek in these schools from San Diego in the south to Eureka in the north looked to him for inspiration and guidance, and he never failed to encourage and support them by every means within his power.

In those days too he had strong graduate classes in the University. In these Pindar and Plato were the authors chiefly studied, and all who came under his influence felt and responded to the charm of his manner, the sincerity of his enthusiasm, and the sterling solidity of his scholarship. He was always a leader also in the company of scholars, not only among his colleagues in the rapidly expanding University, but also among a wide circle of friends in other institutions of learning both in this country and in Europe. He was one of the founders of the Philological Association of the Pacific States and for years one of its most ardent supporters, and twice its president. For many years also he was a member of the executive board of the San Francisco Archaeological Society, and in the year 1907-8 spent the winter at Athens as Professor in the American School.

Although the author of many articles dealing with literary and philological subjects, he published but one book, an edition of the *Iliad* xix-xxiv, in the College Series of Greek Authors (1899). An edition of Pindar, though projected, was never completed owing to his failing health. A prose translation of the odes and fragments of Pindar was made during the early years at Berkeley, but it too was never finally prepared for the press and now reposes among the archives of the University library. Yet, though he published comparatively little, he succeeded in making his influence widely felt and his memory will always be sacredly cherished by a large group of friends and acquaintances. In his death the cause of classical studies in this country has lost one of its most loyal and staunchest supporters.

He is survived by his widow, May Wolcott Clapp, and his two daughters.

JAMES TURNER ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

TERESIO RIVOIRA

The study of classical antiquity as well as that of the Middle Ages has suffered grievous loss in the death at Rome, March 3, 1919, of Commendatore G. Teresio Rivoira, best known to the public through his volumes on the origin, development, and derivatives of Lombardic architecture and on Moslem architecture. In a spirit of pure devotion to learning, stimulated and guided by intense patriotic fervor, Commendatore Rivoira had devoted more than fifty years of his life to the study of the ancient and mediaeval monuments of Europe and of the Byzantine and Moslem world. He styled himself the founder of a new science, that of monumental archaeology, which he interpreted as one aspect of the history of civilization. By dint of innumerable travels, absolute system, and perfect steadiness of brain and body even when climbing to dizzy heights, he had accumulated an enormous mass of measurements and other data covering practically all the monuments comprised in this vast field, a veritable armory from which to produce the weapons for his determined attacks on long-established or fashionable theories: for he would not have been the true son of Piedmont that he was if he had not combined with the temperament of the investigator that of the knight-errant. In contrast to the recent German school, who have sought in the East the origins of Byzantine and Lombardic architecture as well as of many other elements in our civilization, and the French, English and American writers, who have emphasized the importance of the rôle played by the Isle de France in the development of Gothic, he found in Italy, and especially in the great structures of imperial Rome, the seeds from which sprang that rich and varied growth.

It was in the genius of the Italic race that he recognized the great creative power which manifested itself in the progressive development of the arts of European civilization; and it is with this doctrine that his name will longest be associated. Probably his greatest individual triumph was the reconstruction of the architectural achievements of the emperor Hadrian: he did the American School of Classical Studies in Rome the great honor of adopting for the medium of his first public presentation of this matter in the year 1910 a lecture which he delivered at that institution. The extent

and character of his researches in the field of Roman architecture were well known to his friends, and it is no betrayal of confidence for me to state that the manuscript of his great work on Roman architecture from Vitruvius to the close of the empire, the appearance of which in his opinion was to mark the culmination of his more than half a century of study, was practically completed before his death. He lived, moreover, to see the triumph of Italian aims and the liberation of many a historic town and many a noble edifice which he knew and loved. Until ten days before his end he worked with unabated vigor; then the insidious malady which has brought deeper gloom to many homes just as the shadows of war time were departing claimed him as its victim.

None of us who knew him will soon forget his fine enthusiasm of voice, glance, and gesture, nor the vast funds of historical and archaeological information so unfailingly at his command. His death comes as a heavy blow to the scholarly community in Rome, and will be felt with especial poignancy by his American colleagues, who revered him as a master, loved him as a friend, and were never sent away empty-handed when they had turned to him for help. Every sentence in his comparatively small amount of literary output had been subjected by him to a process comparable to that through which the purest gold has been refined. The world may accept or reject his conclusions—few there are possessing the competence to pass judgment upon them: but there can be no difference of opinion as to his whole-hearted devotion to his work, and his unstinting employment of the remarkable gifts of eye and mind with which he was endowed. High were his ideals of life and work, precious the memory and inspiring the example which he leaves behind.

A. W. VAN BUREN

ROME
March 5, 1919

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH. 1862-1918

Humanistic studies in America have suffered no greater loss during the academic year now closing than that caused by the death of Professor Kirby Smith of Johns Hopkins University. I say "humanistic" studies because he was more than a professor

of Latin and Greek. His range included many languages and literatures, in which he read widely and from which he absorbed to an amazing degree not merely facts of language and literature, but the spirit of the culture from which they sprang and the essence of the life of which they were the expression. He actually was what classical scholars are so often supposed to be but in fact so rarely are. He was a humanist in the best sense of the word. He was not one of those who in public rave about the beauties of classical literature, but in their own studies and in classroom work confine themselves strictly to the discussion of disputed readings or of doubtful forms. No one ever had more respect for close philological work than he; no one could be more thorough, more critical than he in the preliminary study of a problem; but through the maze of philological minutiae he kept his bearings and he never lost sight of the *summum bonum* of classical studies, the life and literature of Greece and Rome. Like Professor Gildersleeve, who had a profound influence upon his development, he was both philologist and litterateur. With erudition he combined a fine literary appreciation; with technical skill, a curious subtlety of interpretation; and with the scholar's interest in a problem for its own sake, a human sympathy as wide as the world.

I first met him when I was a graduate student at Johns Hopkins many years ago. He was then collegiate professor of Latin, but he gave some courses in the graduate school. He lectured to us on the elegiac poets. To me who had just begun graduate work, the detailed character of his treatment, the elaborate care with which he discussed the text, the length of time he devoted to the question of the transposition of lines, the extent of the bibliography and all the other paraphernalia of technical scholarship were in the highest degree alarming. Not thus were Roman poets treated in the light and airy atmosphere of the undergraduate classroom from which I had so recently emerged. I had expected graduate work to be different from that which I had done in college, but I had never dreamed that an elegiac poet could be made the vehicle for such a burden of learning as this. But after a few weeks I realized how wrong my first impression had been.

He was merely clearing the way for his interpretation of the poets, and was following the method—unexcelled in thoroughness—of the Hopkins school. As soon as he had disposed of these preliminaries and had satisfactorily established a sound basis for literary discussion, he gave us an interpretation of Propertius and Tibullus that for vivid portrayal, critical acumen, and sympathetic appreciation was as charming as it was effective. Many years later I heard him lecture on Propertius at a meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. Some of the readers of this *Journal* heard him on that occasion and will recall the qualities of his literary style. He showed us Propertius as he was, with all his foibles, his genius, his brilliancy, and his egotism; and then with the art of the accomplished essayist he set him against the background of the Roman society of the time of Augustus, itself sketched in with consummate appreciation of light and shade. And not long ago, on a less formal occasion, I heard him read a paper on Tibullus at a meeting of a literary club in Baltimore, when he gave a number of translations of that poet's elegies, admirably done. Very few of those present were classical men. They were professors from various departments of the university and professional or business men of Baltimore, but I am inclined to think that they carried away with them a more vivid and lasting impression of Tibullus' art than most of the students to whom we professors of the classics deliver our lectures.

He loved old books and new, he loved a good story, and he loved his friends. Of the latter the number was legion. His buoyancy of temperament, his unfailing good humor, his keen sense of the ridiculous, his catholic human interests, gave his personality a unique attractiveness. Wherever he went he made friends, not only for himself, but also for classical studies. When I was at Hopkins he was the most popular instructor in the university, and I have no doubt that he remained so to the end. Nor is it likely that any of his students will ever doubt the value of the classics. He made them feel, as he himself sincerely felt, that only through Latin could one attain to a real appreciation of the literature of the world and see its successive stages in true perspective.

G. J. LAING

THE ONE AND THE MANY

BY JOSIAH BRIDGE

Westminster School, Simsbury, Connecticut

In the suburbs of a large New England city is a flourishing high school. The townspeople are justly proud of their school—its buildings, record, and principal. Ten years ago the principal taught Greek. In that year a class of five elected the course. This class dwindled to three, and the school board ordered the course to be discontinued. Greek has not been taught in that high school since.

The father of one of those three boys was a college professor and a member of the school board. With the principal's help he might have had the course continued, but would not be placed in the position of persisting so largely in his son's interest. He consoled himself with the thought that colleges had beginners' classes in Greek, and the deficiency could there be made up.

But the boy went to a college which had no beginners' class in Greek. After two years of work, successful in all branches, but especially so in Latin, the boy himself felt a vital lack in his education which Greek alone could supply. In this critical situation the father consulted a friend who taught Greek in a neighboring town. As a result, the boy spent his next summer's vacation studying Greek largely by himself, and with the help of good brains and a strong will he passed satisfactorily, in the fall, entrance examinations in Xenophon and Homer. For two years more he studied Greek in college. When he graduated he was rewarded with the highest honor of the class, the Athens fellowship.

Good as his scholarship was, it is certain that in Greek he would have been much better equipped, could he have had the regular high-school course of preparation. In the honor which he finally achieved, as far as Greek went, his own high school could claim no share.

Why should any school, in its zeal for the interests of the many, so neglect the highest interest of the few? Surely a brief statement of reasons for including Greek in the public high-school course is timely.

When all colleges demanded Greek for the A.B. degree, Greek was given generally in private schools and in public high schools. Now that most colleges no longer require Greek for any degree, the center of demand has been shifted from the college to the school and local community. Private schools are fostering the demand more or less. Public schools have largely dropped Greek altogether. Those that still keep it are generally teaching small classes.

The reasons why public high schools are largely dropping Greek are given with almost brutal frankness in this sentence from the report of two college professors, a report which stopped the study of Greek in the high school of one of the large manufacturing cities of the eastern states: "As Greek is no longer required for entrance to college, its teaching should be discontinued in public high schools, and the money and energy which is spent upon it should go into subjects for which there is a more general demand." To these three reasons, first, that Greek is not required for college, second, that there is not enough public demand, and third, that the comparative cost in money and energy is too large, is sometimes added this fourth, that the results, judged by progress toward the goal, are generally unsatisfactory.

It is obvious, then, that, if Greek is to be even partially reinstated in the public high schools, local communities and school authorities must be convinced that it fills a need which should be satisfied, and that it can be taught so as to satisfy that need. Here is our task; how are we to meet it?

Why should Greek be offered in the public high schools? Perhaps the best argument for the case is found in the reasons published some years ago as those of the headmaster of Harrow for discontinuing the study. The knowledge of Greek, he claimed, is a most precious intellectual possession. Nothing can quite replace it as a vehicle for creating accuracy and refinement of

thought; for filling the mind with high literary ideals. The ability to read and enjoy Homer and Plato enormously increases the happiness of life. But it is common knowledge that the vast majority of boys who learn Greek at school do not learn enough to enjoy or even to read the great masterpieces of Greek literature. If they did, no sacrifice would be too great to make in order to retain Greek. As they do not, Greek should be struck from the ordinary curriculum of public schools; and that, too, although it is his conviction, after forty years of experience as a school-master, "that the study of Greek, when pursued far enough to appreciate the literature, is the most elevating of all studies."

Surely this is very valuable expert testimony. The study of Greek, carried to its proper limit, is worth any sacrifice, and is the most valuable of all studies. What more does the fondest enthusiast claim? But as to the conclusion that because the goal is too seldom reached, the public-school boy and girl must be debarred the opportunity—how unheroic, how undemocratic! Even if results are as bad as claimed, may we not still bid our pupils "hitch their wagons to the stars" while we improve our methods of approach?

But while we can improve, and constantly are improving, our methods, of which more, later, there is abundant evidence that, as it is, the results won by Greek teachers bear favorable comparison with those shown in any other department of study. No valid objection to the study of Greek in public schools can be maintained on the ground of unsatisfactory teaching. On the other hand, the charge is sound that those responsible for dropping Greek from the public high schools, unconscious though they be, are really traitors to the soul of democracy in her very temple.

For what does democracy in education mean if not that every boy and girl shall have the opportunity to pursue that course of study which shall best equip him or her for the highest service of which he or she is capable? There is no conflict of opinion among those whose experience qualifies them to judge as to the unique benefit derived from Greek by those whose natural endowment lets them reap the proper fruit from the study. In every community there are such boys and girls, and these are by no

means confined to well-to-do, cultured, or native families. Are such children to be debarred from their best intellectual or spiritual food because they are few and cannot afford the expense of out-of-town or private schools where Greek is taught? Is it not possible to make our local communities see that it is a failure in democracy not to furnish their best brains with the best food, regardless of expense?

It might be assumed that members of classical associations, thereby committed to the cause of Greek, would concede the soundness of this demand on the principles of democracy, but that it would be hard to get the backing of other educational leaders. Instructive in this connection are the results of a questionnaire recently completed by the New England Classical Association. A set of questions was sent to New England Latin teachers, and a similar set over a broader field to college presidents, school superintendents, and instructors in pedagogy and educational psychology, whom, for brevity, we will call specialists in education. Among other questions the specialists were asked whether, in their opinion, Greek should be taught in public high schools; the Latin teachers were asked whether they would co-operate in creating or increasing a demand for Greek. Less than a third of the Latin teachers who answered were willing to do anything toward promoting the study of Greek. The reports of some of the willing ones are illuminating. "The sentiment of the city is strongly against Greek. It was a struggle to keep it up as long as I did," writes one. "Although I am willing to co-operate in creating a demand for the study of Greek, my actions are governed by officials who are averse to the humanities," writes another. "It seem to me if I did [so co-operate] I should be working against the policy of the school," writes a third. Thus a kind of loyalty shackles these friends. Then some of the only teachers of classics in the different schools frankly admit that they know no Greek and do not care to help. A cheering contrast is furnished by the answers of the specialists. Of the 143 answers received from these, 73 were favorable. That over 50 per cent of these influential specialists in education desire to keep Greek in the high-school course because of needs which it best supplies and because of a

belief that every boy and girl who wants to study Greek should have the opportunity is more than encouraging. It suggests that one of our first steps should be to accept the invitation made by one of these specialists, "that the classicists should join hands with the educational psychologists."

We have, then, powerful allies outside our special field ready to help us convince our local communities that the study of Greek in public high schools fills a need which should be satisfied. We have, too, arguments from experience to present to the hard-headed business men who demand proof that Greek is "practical" from their point of view. One school, for instance, has come through experience to require Greek from all its pupils, not strictly scientific, whose first year in Latin has been successful for reasons similar to those for which it encourages football. It knows no sport like football to teach a boy not to flinch; Greek, on the mental side, best fills this bill. It was found that boys avoided the study because it was hard. To give way on that ground was a weakening of moral fiber. To master Greek requires accurate thought and fearless attack of a hard task. The two qualities next to integrity that a business man most desires in his employee are accuracy and no fear of a hard job. If "practical" properly signifies, as Sill says, "effectual in attaining one's end," there is no more "practical" study than Greek for fitting a youth for business life.

But even with the help of our allies we are not going to succeed soon in reinstating Greek in the public schools—and perhaps fortunately—till we teachers of Greek have learned more thoroughly the lesson from our defeats. There is no question, and never has been, of the supremacy of Greek. But no one knows better than the teachers of Greek themselves how far below their aims they have fallen in teaching their pupils to read Greek masterpieces with enjoyment. Little real comfort we get from the consciousness "how far high failure overleaps the bounds of low successes." We can and must teach Greek better. "The real problem," writes one college president, "is not whether education will always deal with the humanities; it always has, and it always will. The real question is whether the classics shall be taught as

a humanity. They have, unfortunately, in some cases strayed a long way from it."

We need not here take the time to look back in the past for reasons why we have not succeeded better. More cheering and more helpful is the forward look from present evidences of progress. First among the promising portents note the comprehensive examination of the College Entrance Board. Though still somewhat shackled by tradition, it tells the secondary school teachers that they can at last fearlessly teach their pupils in their own way to read Greek. If their pupils can show the power to read intelligently easy Greek prose and passages from Homer of only ordinary difficulty, they need have no fear of results, even though they can not reproduce Greek forms to the satisfaction of Greek scholars. This is as it should be, and, properly treated, implies no lowering of the bars of scholarship, merely a transfer of emphasis in the earlier stages of the study. Our one aim is to get our pupils to read Greek masterpieces with appreciation. This can only be when they read them understandingly in the Greek. Translation is only a step toward this goal. Preparation for the comprehensive examination makes it easier for the secondary-school teachers to keep the one aim always in sight than it was when they were compelled to prepare for separate examinations in Greek grammar and composition.

The second sign of progress is found in recent beginners' books. Not only is there improvement in the books following the traditional methods; any teacher who has familiarized himself at all with Rouse's work, no matter what he thinks of the so-called "direct method," must have been helped in his own teaching. Those who have used the still more recent *First Year of Greek* by Allen, a book intended for college beginners, must have glimpsed the possibility of better results in secondary-school work when the proper textbook for younger beginners along similar lines has appeared. As it is, we Greek teachers have no excuse today for not meeting the plea of one of our allies, springing from his own experience, that the teaching of the classics be made less fragmentary than in the past, that pupils may realize that Greek and Latin authors may be read for pleasure.

Greatest of all our allies in inciting young America to the study of Greek is the spirit of America and the allies in the recent war, a spirit one with the Greek at its best. It is the spirit of Marathon and Thermopylae in fighting to the end for the freedom of the small state from foreign despotism. It is the glad spirit of the Greeks with Xenophon, who abode by their oaths, and hence knew that the gods were their allies against a perjured foe. It is the spirit of heroism in staking all for the best. It blossoms in this voice from the trenches: "Until I became a part of the war, I was a doubter of nobility in others and a sceptic as regards myself. The growth of my personal vision was complete when I recognized that the capacity of heroism is latent in everybody, and only awaits the bigness of the opportunity to call it out."

"The bigness of the opportunity!" And we are told that Greek, conquered, is worth any sacrifice and is the most valuable of all studies. If this message could be carried with conviction to the hearts of our boys and girls in the public schools, would not the spirit of the trenches assert itself, and would not their own demand for the opportunity to study Greek become irresistible? And who is so fit to carry the message as the classical teachers in charge of their first-year Latin? If these teachers fail in their opportunity, then indeed the state of Denmark needs a doctor's care.

Another set of allies is suggested by an answer given by a Latin teacher to the question, "Is there a demand for the study of Greek in the school today?" "Not a conscious one," she wrote. "There is an interest in Greek coming from the study of Greek history." This answer is in accord with the following recent experience in a private school. Owing to the enforced absence of the teacher of history, it became necessary for the Greek teacher to complete the course in Greek history with a class of young boys who would normally begin Greek the following year. Bury's smaller history was the textbook. In explaining the phrase "Zeus Soter," the word *ἱεθεῖς* was given the class in Greek letters. The next day pictures of fish with titles in Greek capitals adorned blackboards of the school. For the maxim, "Nothing to excess," the class was again given the Greek in

Greek letters; and when Socrates and the Delphic oracle was reached γνῶθι σεαυτόν was served them in the Greek. In their next test the class was asked to explain the connection of these three Greek expressions with history. All answers were satisfactory, except that one small boy spelled "know thyself" *no thiself*. This class finished Bury's history at the end of the winter term. By unanimous vote they asked to begin their Greek with the spring term. Their request was granted, with highly gratifying results.

It would be an enormous help to the cause of the classics if all teachers of first-year Latin were also enthusiastic Greek students who could and would present the case of Greek to their promising pupils. It would also be a gain if pupils studied Greek history during their first year in high school under enthusiastic teachers of Greek. The colleges can do no better service to the classics than to send out to every community such Hellenists as teachers of Latin and of ancient history.

As a closing offering, hear these two cheering messages from our allies, which are at the same time challenges to action. The first was given recently in a personal interview by a state secretary of education. "I greatly deplore," he said, "the loss of contact of the United States of America with Greek culture: . . . The whole essence of democracy is opportunity, and the whole essence of opportunity for a pupil is to fulfill his God-given bent. If this leads to Greek culture, he has an indefeasible right to his opportunity there." The second is an answer given in the above mentioned questionnaire by the principal of a state normal school. "I favor the teaching of Greek in secondary schools," he writes, "if there is one pupil who wishes to study it. It is likely to be someone who is worth helping."

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and by Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Miss Bertha Green, Hollywood High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

California

Berkeley.—The fourth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific States will be held in Berkeley, California in the week beginning July 7, during the summer session of the University of California. Of interest to teachers of the classics is the fact that Lane Cooper, professor of English Literature at Cornell University, is to give a course in the summer session at Berkeley on The Classics for English Readers; a study will be made of the ancient classics in standard translations. In the same session Dr. Torsten Petersson will offer a course on Roman Literature and one on Cicero, dealing with him as a man of affairs and as an author; Professor George M. Calhoun will teach Greek for beginners and lecture on "The Comedies of Aristophanes." Professor John J. Van Nostrand in his course entitled "Roman and Barbarian" will make a study of Roman influence upon Western Europe. In the University of California's summer session in Los Angeles Dr. Walter A. Edwards, recently president of the Classical Association of the Pacific States, will deal with the problems of the second year in Latin; he will also offer a course in Latin composition, and one on the Roman elegiac poets.

Illinois

Chicago.—The Greek and Latin section of the Educational Conference of the Academies and High Schools in Relations with the University of Chicago held on May 9 was well attended and enthusiastic. Professor F. J. Miller presided. Especial interest was excited in Professor Laing's demonstration of Roman costumes with the aid of his students.

The program follows. "Co-ordination between English and Latin," C. E. Pence, Harvard School, Chicago; "Standardized Tests in Latin," Harry F. Scott, University High School; Demonstration of Roman Costumes with Figurines by Members of Professor Laing's Class in Roman Private Life: Curule Magistrate, Miss Bennett; Citizens of Equestrian and Plebeian Rank,

Miss Stejskal and Miss Miller; Boy, Miss Crowder and Miss McCarthy; Girl, Miss Van Deweer and Miss Fortune; Matron, Miss Young and Miss Rust. (Figurines and costumes made by the students). "The Proposed American League for Classical Studies," W. L. Carr, University High School.

Iowa

Indianola.—Miss Joanna Baker, of Simpson College, sends us an interesting modern parallel to the ancient story of how the geese saved Rome. She writes:

Perhaps many of the readers of the *Classical Journal* have noticed how the ducks of Zale-Zir saved the British, early last autumn. The British had the Upper Lake, keeping back the Bulgars. The connecting stream to the north was almost impenetrable, because it was a maze of reeds and swamps. However, the orderly set out one night to visit the outposts up the river, nearly two miles from camp. "It was very dark. As he neared the sentry, he heard the movement of wings," says the report. "He distinguished flock after flock of ducks, flying from their night rest among the reeds."

This peculiar circumstance led to an investigation. It was learned that some two hundred German raiders were approaching. By means of this information, the British were enabled to make an attack upon the enemy, utterly routing them, killing many, and capturing others, until probably "no more than six of the raiders ever reached Bulgar lines."

Massachusetts

Northampton.—The second Annual Conference of the Latin departments of Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley, which was planned to continue the work of the meeting at Vassar in the autumn of 1917, was held at Smith College on March 21 and 22. Mount Holyoke was represented by Professors Searles, Taylor, and Waites; Vassar, by Professors Moore, Haight, and Saunders; Wellesley, by Professors Hawes and Walton and Dr. Miller; and Smith, by all the members of the Latin department.

The opening address was delivered on Friday evening, March 21, by Paul Elmer More, of Princeton, New Jersey, and was a stimulating and well-rounded presentation of the subject "Latin and the Great War." His theme was taken from the letter of a French captain, who recently wrote from the trenches, "*Nous combattons pour l'humanité et pour les humanités.*" A meeting for the consideration of problems in Latin teaching and curriculum was held on Saturday morning. In the evening papers were read concerning aspects of classical studies in America, England, and Rome, and concerning Latin in relation to other courses. Especially interesting was a report from Wellesley of a course in Latin literature for the purpose of general culture, open without prerequisite other than the entrance requirement, and a report from Mount Holyoke on work in derivatives for Freshman classes. Through the papers and discussions each department was enabled to know better the conditions and problems at the other colleges represented, and to work with greater sympathy and co-operation.

Ohio

Columbus.—The spring meeting of the Columbus Latin Club was in the form of a luncheon at the Hotel Chittenden, March 29. The following program was presented: "The Second Type of Latin Conditionals," Professor R. V. Smith, Capital University; "Glimpses of Neo-Latin," Professor Henry R. Spencer, Ohio State University. Miss Harriet Kirby of North High School and Dr. Dwight Robinson of Ohio Wesleyan University participated in the discussion by making eloquent pleas for the rigid adherence to high scholastic standards in the educational reconstruction affecting the courses of study of secondary schools and of universities. Covers at the luncheon were laid for fifty-three guests, including members from Union, Delaware, Licking, and Fairfield counties in addition to the local membership.

Pennsylvania

Philadelphia.—A symposium on educational reconstruction was held by the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies, February 21. The speakers and their subjects were as follows: "Principles and Policies, National, State, Municipal," Dr. Francis Burke Brandt, of the Philadelphia Public Schools; "The New Humanities," Dean William McClellan, the Wharton School of Finance, the University of Pennsylvania; "Teachers' Salaries," President Joseph Swain, Swarthmore College; "The Higher Education," Professor William I. Hull, Swarthmore College; "Samson: a Field for Cultural Service," Professor Elihu Grant, Swarthmore College; "Can the Primacy of Culture Be Restored?" Rev. John A. MacCallum, the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church. The papers read for the symposium on the value of the classics, mentioned in the January issue of this *Journal* (p. 270), have been collected and published by the University of Pennsylvania. A copy of this pamphlet, containing fifty-one pages, may be obtained by sending five cents in stamps to Professor George Depue Hadzists, University of Pennsylvania.

Pittsburgh.—The final meeting of the Classical Association of Pittsburgh and vicinity was held on May 17. The program was as follows: "Vergil's Account of Aeneas' Life in Italy Compared with those by Cato, Livy, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus," Miss Laura C. Green, Pennsylvania College for Women; "How to Make the Study of Latin Syntax Interesting and Profitable," Prof. T. W. Dickson, Dean Thiel College; Round Table Conference: "Syntax in the Second Year," Chairman, Mr. Frank T. McClure, Allegheny High School; (a) "Amount," Discussion led by Mr. Frank L. Matteson, Peabody High School; (b) "How?" Discussion led by Mrs. Mabel C. Baird, Fifth Avenue High School; (c) "Why?" Discussion led by Prof. B. L. Ullman, University of Pittsburgh; "The Classics and the Social Emphasis in Education," Prof. John Mossatt Mecklin, University of Pittsburgh.

General Comment

[Edited by Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The University of Missouri.]

It is well known that the General Advisory Committee of the Classical Conference of the National Education Association recommended certain proposals for a classical league at the meeting in Pittsburg last July. A pamphlet on *The Proposed Classical League* was issued in December explaining the purpose of such a league. The document has been submitted to all the members of the General Advisory Committee and by a large majority it has been entirely approved. At the meeting of the National Education Association next July the proposed Consitution will be submitted to the Classical Conference for adoption. Meanwhile suggestions as to the league and its work should be communicated to the Chairman of the General Advisory Committee, Dean Andrew F. West, Princeton University.

Among recent works of literary interest must be placed *A Writer's Recollections* by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, granddaughter of Dr. Thomas Arnold. From her pages one carries away very lively pictures of many of the most eminent personages of the Victorian Age. As the wife of an Oxford tutor she was acquainted with the great English scholars of the past generation, and she is able to give us many interesting characteristics of them. Pattison and Jowett she knew well, her sympathies inclining her toward the liberal element in the University. She frequently met young Bywater at Lincoln college where the talk was largely about foreign scholars and research. Pattison was always urging her to "get to the bottom of something," to "choose a subject, and know everything about it." "The Rector would walk up and down, occasionally taking a book from the crowded shelves, while Mr. Bywater and Mrs. Pattison smoked." Much in the book is said about Jowett and his influence among the students. Mrs. Ward devotes several pages to a discussion of the value of the classics. "I shall never forget the first time, when, in middle life, I read in the Greek, so as to understand and enjoy, the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. The feeling of sheer amazement at the range and power of human thought—and at such a date in history—which a leisurely and careful reading of that play awakened in me, left deep marks behind." From her father's autobiography she quotes the following: "In proportion to a man's good sense and soundness of feeling are the love and admiration, increasing with his years, which he bears toward Horace." As for herself she says: "Now, for many years, the daily reading of Greek and Latin has been not only a pleasure, but the only continuous bit of mental discipline I have been able to keep up."

The publishers of these two volumes have yielded to the mercenary tendency of the age. The whole work could have been confined easily to a single volume, and three dollars would have been a high price to ask for it: they have seen fit to issue the work in two light volumes, fixing the price at six dollars net.

Last year the Oriental Club of Philadelphia issued, under the editorship of Professor Roland G. Kent, of the University of Pennsylvania, an account of *Thirty Years of Oriental Studies*. The portion of the account that is of most interest to classical students is "Thirty Years of Indo-European Studies," contributed by Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, of Yale University. In a dozen pages Professor Hopkins summarizes the great advance made in the various fields of Indo-European philology. The foundations of such work naturally were built on a knowledge of language, and the early period was given chiefly to linguistic studies. The American Whitney will always rank among the greatest names in the history of Sanskrit and the science of language. In America at the present time chief interest and advance is to be noticed in the study of comparative religion and several of our scholars stand in the first rank. Archaeology also has assumed an important position and American workers are among the most distinguished. The number of students in Sanskrit has always been small, and most of these desired merely some insight into historical grammar. If classical philology is to be regarded as a science whose object it is to study all phases of a great civilization, then language, man's chief characteristic, must be studied scientifically; this will involve a study of its history and this, in turn, will require a study of cognate tongues. That cognate tongue which can present the earliest recorded forms of Indo-European speech must be of prime importance for a scientific knowledge of the classical languages. Sanskrit is the oldest extant representative of Indo-European speech. The man who has gained a "practical" knowledge of a modern Romance tongue for the sole purpose of "pushing" some article of trade in a foreign country will care as little to learn that this tongue is descended from a language that possessed at least eight cases, as will the "painted savage" to learn that his pony with solid hoofs may be descended from an ancestor whose feet had five toes. The scholar, however, must know something of the history and the laws of language; the man of science must know something of evolution and palaeontology.

Various interesting memorials to Professor Kirby Flower Smith will be found in the *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine* for March. Special attention may be called to the touching verses of Professor Gildersleeve, and the account of his life and character by Professor Mustard. Included also is Professor Smith's address before the Association of American Universities at Cambridge, December 5, 1918. This address, on "The Future of the

Humanities in Education," delivered the day before his sudden death, emphasizes the need of conserving at the present time both science and literature as instruments of training in our colleges. The advantages derived from science are obvious, and it is to the less obtrusive, but equally important, influence of literature on character that the address is devoted. In the study of literature the classics must occupy a very important place for three reasons. In the first place, "in practically every department of creative literature the primacy of the masterpieces bequeathed by Greece and Rome cannot be successfully challenged." In the second place, the whole of our occidental civilization is merely "the preservation and development of the legacy left us by Greece and Rome. The importance of the humanities is more than aesthetic; it is also genetic and historical." In the third place, "nothing so classifies and discloses the syntactical and logical relations of language itself or so clarifies one's conceptions of language as an art as a thorough grounding in the humanities." To this is added the advantage that Latin gives in acquiring a knowledge of French, Spanish, and Italian. Science deals so much with formulas that they are likely to become hypnotic. The study of language tends to keep the mind flexible and so affords constant mental discipline. History, syntax, archaeology, everything that can illumine and explain a remote period, are of importance; but the most important and abiding value of the humanities "is spiritual and aesthetic." This is the message which the teacher should convey to his undergraduates. Anyone who is grounded in the humanities will be enabled to spend his leisure with profit; he "can even dawdle to advantage."

Competition for Rhodes Scholarships in this country will be resumed next October. One appointment will be open to every state in the union, and in sixteen states which, because of war conditions, made no appointment in 1918, two candidates may now be appointed. Most revolutionary is the removal of the qualifying examination heretofore required of all candidates by the Oxford authorities. Henceforth "it will only be necessary for candidates to make formal application endorsed by the authorities of their college or university. The selection will be made in the future, as in the past, on the basis of a man's record in school and college according to the four points outlined in the Rhodes Will: (1) scholarship, (2) character, (3) interest in outdoor sports, and (4) interest in one's fellows and instincts for leadership. Of these qualifications the greatest emphasis should be laid on the first two." This last caution is very important because in the early years of the scholarships cases of undue emphasis upon athletics by the appointing committee were not unknown, the meaning of sport in the British sense not being understood.

What will be the result of the removal of examinations formerly required in Greek, Latin, and mathematics? Certainly wide powers of discretion are

now lodged in the state committees of appointment. I quote the following from a letter recently received from Professor Frank Aydelotte, who is the American secretary to the Rhodes trustees: "I do not myself believe that these new regulations will do any real injury to classical scholarship. The plain fact is that an American who had got up Greek merely for Responsions is, as you intimate, wholly unprepared to get much profit from the teaching of classics at Oxford. The authorities there feel justifiably that this very small requirement merely serves to deter students who are otherwise prepared to profit by the very broad range of other subjects taught at Oxford—a range which corresponds to that in our larger American universities. It seems very desirable that some of our better men who are studying modern history, or modern literature, or sciences should have an opportunity to live in the atmosphere of broad and thorough scholarship at Oxford."

At the same time there comes from Oxford the news that the Congregation of the University has abolished Greek as a necessary subject for Responsions, the vote standing practically two to one against the Greek requirement. Among those who voted against Greek was the Regius Professor of Greek. Like his illustrious predecessor, Ingram Bywater, Professor Gilbert Murray had long felt that little good came from the universal requirement. In the words of Bywater: "Where the study of Greek is obligatory, the ordinary student learns little more than the elements of the language, and certainly never succeeds in realizing to the full its beauties or the greatness of the thinking that is to be found in Greek philosophy. Then, again, my view is that science has now got into such a position that you must let scientific men arrange their course of study in accordance with their own notions." This is all reasonable enough, but the strange thing is that those who would substitute a new course of study and a new training are not satisfied with a new mark. The men of science, who often pride themselves on their disregard for tradition, in this case would throw over the substance and then fight for the mere name. In this country they were not content with the degree of Bachelor of Science, which clearly indicated the nature of their training, but they insisted on the degree in Arts, to the utter confusion of that degree. In America today the B.A. degree is wholly without meaning and is rapidly falling into contempt, representing as it does a mere numerical accumulation of hodgepodge credits, based on the false assumption that all conceivable subjects for study are intellectual peers. In an age impatient of distinctions and clamoring for their removal is Oxford inclined to yield to the popular cry and reduce its distinctive training to the monotonous level of that which can be attained already in any one of the half-dozen highly equipped modern English universities? Has the war shown that the Oxford man was out of touch with the problems of modern life? The part so efficiently played recently by her graduates proves the contrary; and their noble ideals, largely imbibed from Plato and Greek philosophy and history, have prevailed against a seemingly overwhelming assembly of modern scientific engines of war.

Book Reviews

Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie von Ausgang des klassischen Altertums bis auf Goethe und Wilhelm von Humboldt. I. Mittelalter, Renaissance, Barock. VON KARL BORINSKI. Heft IX, Das Erbe der Alten. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914. Pp. xii+324. M. 8.

The long delay in noticing the present work has been due to the desire to treat both volumes together. Since, however, the second volume has not appeared even yet, as far as can be learned, and while in the present chaotic conditions which prevail in Central Europe it may be many years before it is published, if ever, it seems best not to wait longer in calling the attention of classical scholars in our own country to this remarkable book. To a higher degree than any even of its predecessors in this valuable series, Borinski's monograph presents the influence of classical thought as a constant force dominating every phase of literary and artistic theory, often in apparently remote fields, for a thousand years. The range is wide, the erudition astounding, the mastery of the difficult and frequently obscure material complete. The highly condensed treatment enables the author to touch upon a multitude of themes, but, it must be confessed, adds not a little to the difficulty of the reader, as much is treated by suggestion, allusion, and an almost cryptic reference which makes severe demands upon attention and general information. The scheme of presentation makes this obscurity almost necessary, but one must express a regret that the net result must be to prevent the work from becoming really popular, even among those in whose mother-tongue it is written. Still, no student of the influence of classical antiquity upon mediaeval and modern civilization can afford to disregard this book, and through the lecture room and further studies which it is sure to evoke, its influence ought to spread to the general cultivated public.

The following very brief summary of some of the principal topics treated may show the general scope of the study. The strife between "truth" and "art"; allegory; rhythm, and especially church music; the mechanical and the fine arts; the *imago* or ideal; the place of the man of letters in the social order; *Latinitas*; *amores* and *lusus*; the dominance of artistic theory; *ut pictura poesis*; grotesque and baroque; the hostility to Homer; Aristotle's *Poetics*; the literature of rule and precept, the whole concluding with a series of interesting observations upon Shakespeare's attitude toward the literary controversies, largely Aristotelian in origin, of his day. Among smaller points of peculiar interest to the reviewer (but every reader will note many others,

according to his individual taste and interests) might be noted: the remarks upon the music of the early church (p. 50); religious architecture (p. 61); the column and the arch and dome (p. 61); the ideal of the beautiful Savior (p. 76); anticipations of Carlyle's doctrines of clothes and hero-worship (pp. 89 and 221); the theory of the nude as signifying self-sufficient (p. 90); the "retreat into antiquity" (p. 102); how Boccaccio defended classical letters by representing the Savior as quoting Terence to Saul of Tarsus (p. 117); predecessors of Machiavelli in his appreciation of Livy (p. 130); "cubist" speculation (p. 153); Plato and the theory of perspective (p. 173); Leonardo's denunciation of the "German" tendency to inhibit the free play of body and hands in speech (p. 182); Plato as the remote source of euphuism (pp. 197 ff.); the Adonis allegory and its influence on botanical nomenclature (pp. 204 and 312 f.); Luther's rehabilitation of Aristotle as an authority, but in literature only (p. 219); and the discussion of the vexed question of the etymology of baroque (pp. 199 and 308). But all this gives only the faintest notion of the book's wealth of material, and none at all of the fine critical insight and handling. For the formal literary criticism the English-speaking world has the excellent works of Saintesbury and Spingarn, but I know of nothing which covers the whole field of artistic and literary theory as does Borinski's volume.

W. A. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The Sequence of Tenses in Plautus. University of Pennsylvania
Dissertation. BY EDWARD HOCH HEFFNER. Pp. 52.

The author has examined the tenses of the dependent subjunctives in Plautus with the purpose of determining (1) "to what extent the tense usage is at variance with the familiar doctrine of the sequence of tenses" and (2) "what evidence there is against the theory that the dependent, just as the independent, subjunctives denote absolute time and not time relative to that of the verb of the principal clause." The conclusions reached are that the tenses of the subjunctive denote "relative" time and that "there is such an influence as we commonly call the sequence of tenses."

Such a study cannot fail to be useful, though the results obtained, as we should expect, do not differ much from those obtainable from the study of any considerable portion of Latin literature. No matter what one's particular sequence theory may be, he may fit these examples into it as easily as he may any other large number of examples, and no more easily.

Aside from the introductory and concluding chapters, the chapters deal with "Primary Sequence Dependent upon the Perfect," "Violations of the Sequence Principle," "Instances of Mechanical Conformity to the Sequence Principle," and "Shift in Sequence." Naturally the collection of passages said to violate the sequence principle and those said to illustrate the mechanical conformity to the sequence principle are of most interest.

It would hardly be fair to criticize the author for failing to do things which formed no part of his plan; but in the treatment of a subject as complicated as this, there are certain subsidiary questions which cannot be omitted from the discussion if a real advance is to be made. Most of these are discussed in Methner's article in *Neue Jahrbücher für Pädagogik*, IX (1906), 65-82, 137-63, and 205-17. The article is not mentioned in Dr. Heffner's bibliography.

It will hardly do to speak of the "familiar doctrine of the sequence of tenses," and let it go at that. There are too many varieties of that doctrine. Certainly Professor Walker's¹ theory of sequence has little in common with that held by the author.

Nor may one properly adopt and seek to apply a doctrine of "relative time" without an explanation of the doctrine and without an examination of the arguments against the existence of any such thing in Latin.² A clear understanding of the distinction between "aspect"³ and tense does away with "relative time" not only as applied to the subjunctive but also as applied to the infinitive.

Again any theory of sequence must take cognizance of two classes of clauses.⁴ It is one thing to apply the doctrine to such relative clauses as *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 33.92: *video causas esse permultas, quae istum impellerent*, or to result clauses as *Men.* 712: *quid tandem admisi in me ut loqui non audeam* (p. 19), in which the tense is and must be the same as in the corresponding independent sentence. It is quite another thing to apply the doctrine to such sentences as *Merc.* 426: *mandavit mihi ut emerem*, in which the direct command was an imperative or a present subjunctive. If in such clauses we have a present tense after a past tense in the principal clause (cf. *Liv.* 3.28.1, *imperavit ut sarcinas in unum conici iubeant*) the explanation is that the tense of the direct command is retained, while in the Plautus passage quoted we have the result of something which may possibly be called tense attraction. There was no such thing as a "jussive of the past" in independent sentences; but in dependent clauses the imperfect subjunctive did come to be used with that modal force. However, this is not to say that the past tense of the subjunctive lost its preterite meaning but quite the contrary; *emerem* meant, "it was his will that I should buy." There is no support here for a theory of sequence of tenses. It is interesting to note that in English we have the same choice between present and past; we may say "He ordered that he go" or "He ordered that he should go."

Concerning the examples of alleged mechanical conformity to the sequence principle (collected in chapter v), one group calls for special notice. *Vellem* in *Poen.* 1066, *patrem atque matrem viverent vellem tibi*, is said to be a potential subjunctive referring to the present and in *Asin.* 675, *si hoc meum esset, hodie*

¹ *Classical Journal*, 246-51 and 291-99.

² See Methner in article mentioned, p. 208 f.

³ Cf. Bolling, *Classical Journal*, XIII, 104 ff.

⁴ Cf. Methner's article for a classification of clauses on the basis indicated.

numquam me orares quin darem, orares, is said to denote present time in a contrary to fact conclusion. The imperfect tense in the dependent clause in both cases is said therefore to be due to mechanical sequence. But such an explanation should be satisfactory to no one. The classification of tenses as secondary or primary is one based on meaning. The perfect indicative, for example, is secondary or primary according as it denotes past or present time. Now it is asserted that *vellem* denotes *present* time and takes the *secondary* sequence. The rule here must be that the imperfect tense *form*, no matter what its tense *meaning*, requires the secondary sequence. All difficulty concerning these cases vanishes at once when we give up the notion that the imperfect subjunctive expressed present time.¹ Indeed the "secondary sequence" here goes to prove that the imperfect here as elsewhere was a preterite. Surely *fuit* in *Truc.* 139, *si rem servassem, fuit ubi negotiosus essem*, was not felt as a present.

Unfortunately there is no agreement among scholars concerning sequence of tenses. However, the fundamental trouble is that we have no generally accepted formulation of the tense meanings of the subjunctive. That we may arrive at a formulation worthy of general acceptance, it is necessary, I think, to accept the following principles.

1. A sharp distinction must be made between tense and aspect. Tenses, properly speaking, are three—past, present, and future.
2. The subjunctive in subordinate clauses has a modal meaning. In those clauses in which it is said by some to have lost its modal meaning—in clauses of "actual" result, in relative clauses (relative "purpose" clauses included), in *cum* clauses, and in indirect questions—the subjunctive in fact has the meaning of external determination, a compulsive meaning, "is (bound) to," "was (bound) to." Such a sentence as *hic liber est talis ut quemvis iuvet* (cf. Heffner, p. 18) meant originally and always "this book is of such nature that anyone you please is bound to like it."
3. The tense meaning expressed by the Latin subjunctive forms is the time of the modal idea just as the tense meaning expressed by the English periphrastic modes is the time of the modal auxiliary. In *Quid facerem?* as in "What was I to do?" the verbal idea is left timeless, but the modal idea is placed in past time.

Adopting these principles one may say that the Latin subjunctive in subordinate clauses always tells its own temporal story and that each tense denotes absolute time. In *Amph.* 465 *amovi a foribus maxumam molestiam patri ut liceret tuto illam amplexarier*, it may be that the time of *licere amplexarier* is future to the time of speaking, but the modal idea, will, expressed by the modal form lies in the past, "that it *should* be permitted." In *Asin.* 929, *iam surrupuisti pallam quam scorto dares?* it may be that the cloak at the time of speaking has not been given, but *quam dares* means, "which *was* to be given,"

¹ Cf. Methner, "Der Sogenannte Irrealis der Gegenwart im Lateinischen," *Neue Jahrbücher für Pädagogik*, VIII (1908), 73 ff.

and there is nothing mechanical about the use of the tense. In *Most* 715, *repperi qui senem ducerem*, the fact that the action of *ducerem* is still on the program does not prove that the sequence is mechanical. The speaker says, "how I was to deceive," a perfectly logical thing to say. In saying this he implies "how I could" or "how I might." If he had said *qui ducam* he would have implied "how I can" or "how I may."

FRANK H. FOWLER

THE WILLIAM WARREN SCHOOL

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained from Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City; F. C. Stechert & Co., 29-35 West 32d St., New York City.

- BEAZLEY, J. D. *Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Pp. 236. \$7.00 net.
- BURCHETT, BESSIE R. *Janus in Roman Life and Cult*. A study in Roman religions. Menasha, Wis.: G. Banta. Pp. 75. Paper, \$1.00.
- BURTON, H. E. *The Aeneid of Vergil*. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Boston: Silver, Burdett Co. Pp. xx+530. \$1.50.
- FAIRCLOUGH, H. R. *Vergil*. With an English translation. In 2 volumes. Vol. II. *Aeneid* 7-12 and *Minor Poems*. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Putnam. Pp. 551. \$2.25 net.
- FERRERO, G., and BARBAGALLO, C. *A Short History of Rome*. Vol. II, the empire from the death of Caesar to the fall of the Western Empire, 44 B.C.-476 A.D. New York: Putnam. Pp. 5+516. \$1.90 net.
- FREEMAN, C. E. *Vergil's Aeneid, Book V*. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary. (Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. 18 mo, pp. 144. 15. 9d.
- JACKSON, J. *Select Odes of Horace*. Edited by J. Jackson. (Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. Crown 8vo. 15. 9d.
- JONES, W. H. S. *Pausanias' Description of Greece*. With an English translation. In 6 volumes. Vol. I, Books 1 and 2. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Putnam. Pp. 28+457. \$2.25 net.
- PERRIN, B. *Plutarch's Lives*. With an English translation. In 11 volumes. Vol. VI, *Dion and Brutus, Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus*. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Putnam. Pp. 9+477. \$2.25 net.
- PRICKARD, A. O. *Selected Essays of Plutarch*. Vol. I. Translated with an Introduction. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. xix+336. \$1.50 net.
- STEWART, H. F., and RAND, E. K. *The Theological Tractates of Boethius*. With an English translation. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. With the English translation of "I. T." (1609), revised by H. F. Stewart. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Putnam. Pp. 14+420. \$2.25 net.
- WEST, ANDREW F. *The War and Education*. Addresses. Princeton University Press. Pp. viii+87. \$1.00 net.
- WINSTED, E. O. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. With an English translation. In 3 volumes. Vol. III. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Putnam. Pp. 11+455. \$2.25 net.

GENERAL INDEX

	PAGE
A Connecticut Meeting (Josiah Bridge)	441
Archaeology in 1917 (G. H. Chase)	250
Ariovistus and William II (B. W. Mitchell)	295
A Systematic Study of English Derivatives (T. Jennie Green)	39
Caesar Redivivus (A. P. McKinlay)	103
Can Latin Be Revived as an International Language? (J. B. Pike)	48
Cicero on Peace and War (G. A. Harrer)	26
<i>Fovea</i> —A Play (H. C. Nutting)	176
Friends Outside (Mignonette Spillman)	261
High-School Latin and the Newly Formulated Aims of Secondary Education (Olivia Pound)	111
In Memoriam:	
Frederick Carlos Eastman (F. H. Potter)	63
Edward Bull Clapp (J. T. Allen)	564
Teresio Rivoira (A. W. Van Buren)	566
Kirby Flower Smith (G. J. Laing)	567
Julius Caesar in the English Chronicles (F. S. Dunn)	280
Junior High-School Latin; Its Place in War-Modified Education (Mrs. G. B. Scott)	167
Latin and the Liberal College (Henry W. Litchfield)	6
Latin Examinations as Tests of Intelligence (N. G. McCrea)	498
Latin Word-Order (B. L. Ullman)	404
Maritime Aspects of Homeric Greece (C. A. Maury)	97
Puns and Plays on Proper Names (E. S. McCartney)	343
Report of the Committee on Questionnaire (A. S. Perkins)	84
Representative Government in the Ancient Polities (Tenney Frank)	553
Rhythm versus Rhyme (K. P. Huntington)	513
Rome and her Subject Peoples (G. A. Haver)	550
Semantic Studies in Latin (N. W. DeWitt)	185
Socializing Latin (Flora McKenzie)	56
Some Recent Etymological Blunders (J. C. Nelson)	320
Survival of Type (Frances J. Hosford)	258
The Choice of Paris in Homer (J. A. Scott)	326
The Classicism of Walter Savage Landor (Elizabeth Nitchie)	147
The Disobedience of Clearchus at Cunaxa (J. W. Hewitt)	237
The Early Centuries of <i>Kultur</i> (B. W. Mitchell)	418
The Government of Charlemagne as Influenced by Augustine's <i>City of God</i> (T. K. Sidey)	119
The Latin of the Future (B. L. Ullman)	308
The Michigan Classical Conferences (F. W. Kelsey)	191
The Myth of Io Viewed in the Light of the East Aryan Conception of the Earth (W. F. Warren)	359

GENERAL INDEX

591

	PAGE
The One and the Many (Josiah Bridge)	570
The Origin of the Roman Forum (N. W. DeWitt)	433
Theodore Mommsen (F. W. Kelsey)	224
The Structural Similarity of <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> (Samuel E. Bassett)	557
The Value of the Traditions Respecting the Early Kings of Rome (William Ridgeway)	371
Two Schoolmasters of the Renaissance (Florence A. Gragg)	211
Vitalizing Mythology (Grace P. Smith)	128
Was Athens in the Age of Pericles Aristocratic? (La Rue Van Hook)	472

BOOK REVIEWS:

<i>Stratton, George M.</i> Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle (W. A. Heidel)	75
<i>Browne, Henry.</i> Our Renaissance: Essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies (E. T. M.)	77
<i>Flickinger, Roy C.</i> The Greek Theater and Its Drama (Kelley Rees)	137
<i>Hale, Florence E., and Study, Harry P.</i> Course of Study in Latin and Latin-English, Junior-Senior High School (W. L. Carr)	142
<i>Sanders, Henry A.</i> The New Testament Manuscripts	143
<i>Gaselee, Stephen.</i> The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1917 (M. N. W.)	335
<i>Clark, Albert C.</i> The Descent of Manuscripts (Elmer T. Merrill)	395
<i>Blancké, Wilton W.</i> The Dramatic Values in Plautus (Keith Preston)	460
<i>Geyser, Anthony F.</i> Musa Americana (F. J. Miller)	461
<i>Flickinger, Roy C.</i> Carmina Latina (F. J. Miller)	461
<i>Messer, William Stewart.</i> The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy (H. C. F. Smith)	462
<i>Thomson, J. A. K.</i> The Greek Tradition (E. T. M.)	462
<i>Reynolds, A. B.</i> Latin Reader. Nature Study and Easy Stories for Sight Reading during the First Year in Latin (A. M. Dame)	463
<i>Borinski, Karl.</i> Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie (W. A. Oldfather)	585
<i>Heffner, E. H.</i> The Sequence of Tenses in Plautus (F. H. Fowler)	586

CURRENT EVENTS

Classical Associations and Meetings:

Central Section of the Classical Association of the Pacific States	66
State Committee of the Classical Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association	66
A National Education Conference on the Place of Classical Studies in War-Modified Education	68
National Classical League	69
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	267
Texas State Teachers' Association	269
Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England	387, 451
Tennessee Philological Association	452
The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific States	578
The Greek and Latin Section of the Educational Conference at the University of Chicago	578
The Annual Conference of the Latin Departments of Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley	579
The Classical Association of Pittsburgh	580

Classical Plays and Entertainments:

<i>Catiline Accusatus</i> at the Hackensack High School	67
"Caesar and the Haedui" at Lagrange, Indiana	200
Scenes from the <i>Aeneid</i> and "The School Boy's Dream" at Mount Hermon School	200
Caesar's Bridge Rebuilt	388

	PAGE
Classical Societies and Clubs:	
Greater Boston Classical Club	201
Columbus Latin Club	201
The Latin League of Wisconsin Colleges	202
Chicago Classical Club	268, 387, 450
The University of Chicago Classical Club	450
New York Classical Club	452
Philadelphia Society for the Promoting of Liberal Studies	500
German Educators' Casualty List	70
The Harmon Freshman-Latin Prize at Dennison	390
Walnut Hills High School to Become a Classical High School	389
A Plan of Co-operation between the Junior-Senior Classes in English and Latin at Richmond, Kentucky	450
EDITORIALS:	
Professor Eastman	I
More Encouragement	I
A Thirteen-Volume Index	5
The Humanities in War Time and After	81
The Proposed American Classical League	145
Report of the Treasurer	209
The Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association	273
A Field for the American Classical League	277
The American Academy and the Classics	337
The Preparation of the Board's Latin Papers	338
The General Index	340
The Atlanta Meeting in Prospect	340
The Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of New England	342
Program of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting at Atlanta	401
The Atlanta Meeting	465
The New England Annual Meeting	469
Selling Ourselves	529
Iustitia Tenax	530
American Classical League	531
GENERAL COMMENT	71, 133, 203, 270, 332, 391, 454
NOTES:	
On Caesar <i>B.G.</i> i. 9 (B. M. Allen)	132
Classical Standards in Contemporary Schools (H. M. Poynter)	264
On <i>B.G.</i> i. 40. 5 (B. M. Allen)	265
<i>Abiit, Excessit, Evasisit, Erupit</i> (N. W. DeWitt)	331
Our Needed Renaissance (E. T. M.)	383
On <i>Odyssey</i> xiv. 138-47 (S. E. Bassett)	385
William of Malmesbury and the Lost Books of Livy (E. T. M.)	446
Has Edward Meyer Ever Read the <i>Iliad</i> ? (J. A. Scott)	446
A Grammar-School Course in Classics of One Hundred Years Ago (W. H. Whiting, Jr.)	447
Misalliances on the Ancient and Modern Stage (R. C. Flickinger)	447
Lowell and the Classics (W. C. Gold)	449
Sidon and the Sidonians in Homer (J. A. Scott)	525
Some Corsican Illustrations of Greek Literature (S. N. Deane)	526
Caesar vi. 23 (H. A. Sanders)	527
RECENT BOOKS	80, 144, 208, 272, 464, 589

Classical Association OF THE Middle West and South

Officers of the Association

President

GORDON J. LAING
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

First Vice-President

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Secretary-Treasurer

LOUIS E. LORD
OBERLIN COLLEGE

Vice-Presidents for the States

ALABAMA	HORTENSE THORNTON	BIRMINGHAM
ARKANSAS	GUY A. SIMMONS	CONWAY
COLORADO	CHARLES C. MIEROW	COLORADO SPRINGS
FLORIDA	JOSIAH B. GAME	TALLAHASSEE
GEORGIA	E. K. TURNER	OXFORD
ILLINOIS	KEITH PRESTON	EVANSTON
INDIANA	H. C. MERRILL	FRANKLIN
IOWA	FRANKLIN H. POTTER	IOWA CITY
KANSAS	O. G. MARKHAM	BALDWIN
KENTUCKY	M. A. LEIPER	BOWLING GREEN
LOUISIANA	MARY L. HARKNESS	NEW ORLEANS
MICHIGAN	CHEEVER HOYT	DETROIT
MINNESOTA	ARTHUR L. KEITH	NORTHFIELD
MISSISSIPPI	ALFRED W. MILDEN	UNIVERSITY
MISSOURI	F. C. SHAW	KANSAS CITY
NEBRASKA	SUSAN PAXSON	OMAHA
NORTH CAROLINA	HUBERT M. POTEAT	WAKE FOREST
NORTH DAKOTA	GUY R. VOWLES	FARGO
NEW MEXICO	JEANETTE M. INCHES	ALBUQUERQUE
OHIO	EDWIN L. FINDLEY	CLEVELAND
OKLAHOMA	O. W. JEFFRIES	EDMOND
SOUTH CAROLINA	MINNIE A. GEE	SPARTANBURG
SOUTH DAKOTA	J. H. HOWARD	VERMILION
TENNESSEE	DAVID R. LEE	KNOXVILLE
TEXAS	DANIEL A. PENICK	AUSTIN
UTAH	A. R. ANDERSON	SALT LAKE CITY
VIRGINIA	HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB	LYNCHBURG
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLES E. BISHOP	MORGANTOWN
WISCONSIN	J. U. DALAND	MILTON
WYOMING	IDA B. HULL	SHERIDAN

Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER,
AND

CHARLES H. WELLER
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

CHARLES E. LITTLE
GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE

A. L. BONDURANT
THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

J. B. PIKE
THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South

is organized for the purpose of encouraging the development of the study of the classics; to provide a means of intercommunication between teachers of the classics—whether in the secondary schools, in the colleges, or in the universities of the territory it covers; and generally to promote a unity of thought and action in the broad field of classical teaching. Membership in the Association is open to all teachers of the classics and to other individuals interested in classical studies who reside in the territory covered by the Association. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year; \$1.25 of this amount covers the subscription to the *Classical Journal*, which is a special rate, the regular subscription price being \$2.50 per year. The value of the *Journal*, which is the official publication of the Association, to those interested in the classics, either as students or as teachers, cannot be measured by the annual outlay. The advantages involved in this offer should therefore appeal strongly to those who find themselves in this class.

Application for membership in the Association should be made to the Vice-President of the state in which the applicant resides (see list on page three of cover) or to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

A plan of co-operation has been perfected with the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States. See second cover-page for directions relating to applications for membership.

